

Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies

THE DISCOURSE OF KINGSHIP IN CLASSICAL GREECE

Carol Attack



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

The Discourse of Kingship in Classical Greece

This book examines how ancient authors explored ideas of kingship as a political role fundamental to the construction of civic unity, the use of kingship stories to explain the past and present unity of the polis and the distinctive function or status attributed to kings in such accounts.

It explores the notion of kingship offered by historians such as Herodotus, as well as dramatists writing for the Athenian stage, paying particular attention to dramatic depictions of the unique capabilities of Theseus in uniting the city in the figure of the 'democratic king'. It also discusses kingship in Greek philosophy: the Socratics' identification of an 'art of kingship', and Xenophon's and Isocrates' model of 'virtue monarchy'. In turn, these allow a rereading of explorations of kingship and excellence in Plato's later political thought, seen as a critique of these models, and also in Aristotle's account of total kingship, or *pambasileia*, treated here as a counterfactual device developed to explore the epistemic benefits of democracy.

This book offers a fascinating insight into the institution of monarchy in classical Greek thought and society, both for those working on Greek philosophy and politics, and also for students of the history of political thought.

Carol Atack works on classical Greek political thought and intellectual history. She is currently a fellow of the Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington DC, and a bye-fellow and associate tutor at Newnham College, University of Cambridge. She holds a PhD in Classics from the University of Cambridge (2014), and undergraduate degrees in Classics (Cambridge) and Government (London School of Economics). Carol has held teaching positions in ancient history and classical literature at the University of Warwick and St Hugh's College, University of Oxford, and was recently a postdoctoral researcher on the Anachronism and Antiquity project at Oxford, contributing to the monograph *Anachronism and Antiquity* (written with Tim Rood and Tom Phillips; forthcoming) and preparing a monograph on the temporality of Platonic dialogue. Carol has published several articles and book chapters on topics in Greek political thought, including political thought in the pseudo-Platonic letters, Aristotle's thought on kingship and Foucault on Plato on frank speech. She serves as associate editor for Greek political thought for the journal *Polis*. Her current research continues her work on fourth-century Greek political thought, with a particular focus on the political and ethical thought of Plato and Xenophon.

Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies

Titles include:

Combined Warfare in Ancient Greece

From Homer to Alexander the Great and His Successors

Graham Wrightson

Power Couples in Antiquity

Transversal Perspectives

Edited by Anne Bielman Sánchez

The Extramercantile Economies of Greek and Roman Cities

New Perspectives on the Economic History of Classical Antiquity

Edited by David B. Hollander, Thomas R. Blanton IV, and

John T. Fitzgerald

The Bible, Homer, and the Search for Meaning in Ancient Myths

Why We Would Be Better Off With Homer's Gods

John Heath

Fantasy in Greek and Roman Literature

Graham Anderson

Piracy, Pillage, and Plunder in Antiquity

Appropriation and the Ancient World

Edited by Richard Evans and Martine de Marre

Romans at War

Soldiers, Citizens, and Society in the Roman Republic

Edited by Jeremy Armstrong and Michael P. Fronda

The Discourse of Kingship in Classical Greece

Carol Attack

For more information on this series, visit: www.routledge.com/classicalstudies/series/RMCS

The Discourse of Kingship in Classical Greece

Carol Attack

First published 2020
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2020 Carol Attack

The right of Carol Attack to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-0-367-20530-0 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-26203-6 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	viii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	ix
Introduction	1
1 King and cosmos in Herodotus	13
<i>Herodotus' 'monarchical model' and the 'despotic template'</i>	14
Differentiating kings and tyrants	16
Kings, custom and order: Herodotus and Heraclitus	17
Kings and knowledge	19
Structure and cyclicalality	20
Kingship in the constitution debate	21
<i>Herodotus' studies of kingship</i>	23
Deioces, the model king of the Medes	23
Psammetichus and Egyptian kingship	26
Amasis and the burdens of divine kingship	28
Kingship at the limits of the Greek world	30
<i>Conclusion</i>	32
2 Monarchy on the democratic stage	39
<i>The Athenian political imaginary and drama</i>	40
<i>The good king in the polis</i>	41
<i>The king and the coherence of the polity: Aeschylus' Persians</i>	41
<i>The king as the focus of supplication</i>	44
Greeks and others: Aeschylus' <i>Suppliants</i>	45
The democratic king deconstructed: Euripides' <i>Suppliants</i>	47
Kingship in Sophocles' <i>Oedipus at Colonus</i>	49
<i>Kingship and autochthony</i>	52
<i>Cosmology and comedy</i>	55
<i>Conclusion</i>	61

3	The discourse of kingship in classical Athenian thought	68
	<i>Structuring the Athenian past in time and space</i>	70
	<i>The Athenian past in rhetoric and philosophy</i>	74
	<i>The focus on Theseus</i>	76
	Isocrates' Theseus	77
	The king as rhetorical exemplar for citizens	84
	<i>Conclusion</i>	86
4	Kingship and Socratic thought	92
	<i>Antisthenes and single-person rule</i>	94
	<i>Xenophon's account of the 'kingly art'</i>	97
	The discourse of kingship in Xenophon's Socratic works	98
	<i>The craft of kingship in the Memorabilia</i>	100
	Kingship in the <i>Oeconomicus</i>	104
	<i>Plato and kingship as a master art</i>	106
	Socrates' 'political craft'	108
	<i>Basilikē technē</i> in the <i>Euthydemus</i> and <i>Republic</i>	110
	The hunt for <i>basilikē technē</i>	112
	<i>Conclusion</i>	115
5	Virtue and monarchy	122
	<i>Isocrates' model of virtue monarchy: the kings of Salamis</i>	123
	The qualities of monarchy	125
	The qualities of the king	128
	Evagoras, myth and history	132
	<i>Xenophon and virtue monarchy: the Cyropaedia</i>	134
	Persians and Medes	136
	Cyrus on campaign	138
	Cyrus in victory	141
	<i>Conclusion</i>	144
6	Kingship in Plato's later political thought	151
	<i>Kingship and time in the Statesman</i>	152
	Cosmology and politics	154
	History and the Age of Zeus	158
	Kingship and craft	158
	Kingship and law	160
	<i>Plato's account of historical process in the Timaeus/Critias</i>	162
	<i>Kingship and time in the Laws</i>	166

	The development and decline of monarchical regimes	167
	Extreme forms of constitutions	169
	Replacing the structure: <i>Laws IV</i>	171
	<i>Conclusion</i>	173
7	'Total kingship' and the rule of law	179
	<i>Aristotle's pambasileia and the metaphysics of monarchy</i>	179
	Aristotle's discussion of monarchy	183
	Platonic and Aristotelian arguments against monarchy:	
	<i>Pol.</i> 3.15–16	185
	Historical examples	187
	<i>The pambasileus in the political imaginary</i>	188
	<i>Conclusion</i>	191
	Conclusion: the imaginary king and the metaphysics of political unity	197
	<i>Bibliography</i>	199
	<i>Index of passages cited</i>	231
	<i>General index</i>	239

Acknowledgements

As the product of a ‘late learner’ this book has many debts, extending over many years. At Wakefield Girls’ High School, Miss Smith and Miss Hardcastle introduced me to Plato and Machiavelli in their Greek and history lessons, while at the London School of Economics Ken Minogue failed to make me a Hobbes scholar; I hope that this contribution to the political philosophy of monarchy would have pleased him. My return to study some time later was facilitated by the Open University and my tutor Barrie Fleet. At Lucy Cavendish College, successive presidents, fellows and students provided further encouragement and intellectual companionship; thanks to Jane McLarty, Anna Abulafia and Isobel Madison for sage advice at various stages of my studies. It saddens me that this route to further study has been rendered inaccessible by changes in the funding of undergraduate studies, which are unfavourable to part-time and mature returners.

My PhD supervisors in the Faculty of Classics at Cambridge, Paul Cartledge and Malcolm Schofield, provided exemplary assistance, as did my examiners Nick Denyer and Chris Pelling. My thesis slowly transformed into this book while I held teaching positions at St Hugh’s College, Oxford and the University of Warwick before returning to Oxford as a postdoctoral research associate in the Faculty of Classics and Junior Research Fellow at St Hugh’s. I owe a great deal to my colleagues on the Anachronism and Antiquity project, Tim Rood, John Marincola, Tom Phillips and Mathura Umachandran, and to the helpful comments of reviewers of this manuscript, especially Grant Nelsestuen.

Drafts of several chapters were presented at seminars in Cambridge and at the following conferences: Chapter 1, Annual Meeting of Postgraduates in Ancient History, Oxford, 2012; Chapter 2, Annual Meeting of Postgraduates in Ancient Literature, RHUL, 2011; Chapter 3, Classical Association Conference, Exeter, 2012; Chapter 6, Southern Association for Ancient Philosophy, Cambridge, 2012; Chapter 7, B Club, Cambridge, 2013, and Institute for Historical Research Early Career Seminar, London, 2013. I owe many insights to discussions at these events. I am also grateful to my colleagues and supervisors, and to Thornton Lockwood and Lynette Mitchell, for sharing unpublished work with me.

Perhaps the greatest debt is owed to my family, both for their support while I wrote and revised the thesis, and for tolerating the significant disruption to our family life that my succession of short-term academic posts entailed. Thank you Alex, Venice, Fred and Laurence.

Abbreviations

- BNJ *Brill's New Jacoby*, edited by I. Worthington. Online at <https://reference.works.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby>
- DK Diels, H. and Kranz, W. (eds.) (1951) *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und Deutsch*, 2 vols. (6th edition, Berlin: Weidmann).
- FGrH *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* = F. Jacoby (1923–1959) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Leiden: Brill).
- IG *Inscriptiones Graecae*
- KRS Kirk, G.S., Raven, J.E., and Schofield, M. (1983) *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts* (2nd edn.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- RO Rhodes and Osborne = Rhodes, P.J. and Osborne, R. (2003) *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404–323 BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- SSR Giannantoni, G. (1990) *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae*, 4 volumes (Naples: Bibliopolis).
- TrGF Snell, B., Kannicht, R., and Radt, S.L. (1971) *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, 5 volumes (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Journal titles are abbreviated following the list maintained by *L'Année Philologique*.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Introduction

Even in modern democracies, royal families and their activities continue to fascinate the population and dominate the media. The accession of Emperor Naruhito of Japan and the beginning of the new Reiwa epoch in May 2019 saw clips of the Shinto rituals and the new emperor greeting his people transmitted around the world. The new Japanese emperor's choice of epoch name, *Reiwa*, with the official meaning 'beautiful harmony', but also connoting order, reflects another key function of monarchy, the connection of the community to a larger cosmic order.¹ The activities of the British royal family continue to fill the front pages of newspapers, with pictures of royal marriages and new babies illustrating a continuing fascination with even peripheral members.² The emotional responses evoked by royal figures in their patriotic subjects demonstrate the continuing symbolic importance of royalty.

Anthropologists and global historians theorise an 'Axial Age' in which new forms of thinking led to cultural and social change across a wide array of world cultures during the eighth to third centuries BCE.³ This age is characterised by the development of new forms of religious activity, typified by the origins and rise of key world religions, but also exemplified by the emergent philosophical traditions of cultures, including that of the classical Greek world. World historians such as Alan Strathern find in the Axial Age a transformation of the idea of kingship, the authority claims through which kings legitimated their power, in which traditional claims to cosmic connections with divinity (which he labels 'cosmic kingship' supported by divinisation) were replaced by individual claims to excellence in one form or another ('heroic kingship').⁴ Another view is offered by David Graeber, who has argued that the sacralisation of kings is related to the economic development of the societies they rule.⁵

The discourse of kingship in classical Greece can be read as an instance of the cultural transformation of the Axial Age in progress, in the problematisation and debate around the source of the political authority held by kings and the distinctions thinkers drew between rulers and ruled. Plato is typically cited as a key representative of Axial Age thought, either in his own right or as the transmitter of Socrates' ideas; the allegory of the cave, and of the philosopher's path upwards to true knowledge, is represented as a paradigmatic example of Axial Age thinking, in which humans grasp for meaning beyond the limits of their lived experience.⁶

2 *Introduction*

However, the discourse of kingship, in its engagement with ancient mythical traditions, as well as new ideas about individual excellence and knowledge, suggests that there was no straightforward transition from one mode of thinking to another, but rather a continuing conversation between new and older ideas.

The presence of this discourse of kingship has been obscured by the predominance of other interests in the political culture of the classical Greek world. Since historians and reformers turned to Athenian democracy as an example in the nineteenth century, it has been the focus of discussions of classical Greek political thought, to the exclusion of other forms of Greek rule. This book aims to recentre the analysis of Greek political thought from a narrow focus on the institutions and practices of the polis, especially the subset of cities identified as democratic in their governance. It shows that even in democratic Athens, where much but not all of the significant theoretical work took place, kings in the form of the mythical Theseus of Athens' past, and in the present arrangements of other places such as Persia and Egypt, played a significant role in the political thinking of citizens and writers. Kings signified stability and order, unity of the human community and its alignment with the over-arching order of the cosmos, if also hinting at the costs associated with the maintenance of social order, and at the risks arising from the exercise of monarchical power.

Scholars have even ruled discussions of non-democratic regimes in both Greek cities and the non-Greek empires as not constituting political thinking, restricting it to arrangements specific to the polis. Monarchy is only involved in its negative form of tyranny. But even tyranny is of increased relevance, with the ancient interest in the figure of the tyrant as an exemplar of bad leadership and governance being invoked in the criticism of current leaders.⁷ Whether this responds to the theoretical interests of US conservative thinkers such as Leo Strauss, or to perceptions of trends in contemporary democratic experience and practice, is unclear.⁸

However, a narrow focus on democracy and theoretical responses to it risks generating limited readings of the ancient theorists, who operated in a world where all the constitutions represented in their typologies – monarchies, oligarchies and democracies – were or had been envisaged to be political possibilities for the present, or in the mythical past; and even the less common forms, among which kingship might be included, remained useful tools for analysis, as well as important components of the political imaginary, the shared set of cultural ideas, stories and emotions that contribute to individuals' political experiences, analysed by social historians such as Nicole Loraux drawing on theorists such as Cornelius Castoriadis. Castoriadis' political imaginary is, in Kevin Olson's phrase, the 'shared, social domain of communication and representation'.⁹ It is populated with mythical figures and familiar narratives which are explored and retold to create, in Charles Taylor's definition, 'that common understanding that makes possible common practices and a widely shared sense of legitimacy'.¹⁰

While monarchy within most ancient Greek cities was only envisaged in the present or future in its negative form of tyranny, the idea of kingship as a form of personal good rule that brought unity and fulfilment to a political community retained its appeal to many thinkers in classical Greece, and provided a tool by

which thinkers could analyse the political situations of their own and other communities. Theorists' concerns extended beyond the immediate world of the polis to encompass the tribal nations identified by Greeks as *ethnē* (referred to here as *ethnos* states), and the larger empires constructed from alliances of such states; while Aristotle differentiates the polis and the *ethnos* state, he retains an interest in the socio-political structures of those.¹¹ David Graeber and Marshall Sahlins investigate the ways in which social the symbolic power represented by the king is both integral to and constrained within monarchical societies. They note the persistence of kingship as a lingering 'ghostly form' providing a 'unifying principle' to societies; they proffer the spirit kings of Madagascar and the modern concept of popular sovereignty as examples of this.¹²

The imagined or mythical actions of heroic kings played an important part in how even democratic citizens imagined that their cities had come into being, and still operated. Thus Greek thought on monarchy presents an interesting case where a critical component of a political ontology, the king, was rarely instantiated in anything like the idealised form, but was present in many forms of cultural production, including drama and art, as well as exerting a continuing fascination for theorists drawing on cultural traditions and myth.

Through maintaining a focus on kingship as a central concern of Greek political thought, this book reveals the prevalence of political myths of kingship at the centre of Greek democratic thought, and an intricate and underexplored web of discussion between political theorists as they explore the paradoxical problem of the relationship between king and polis, and develop competing models, both to position an ontologically distinct 'transcendent metahuman' within human society and to deny the possibility of such a construct.¹³ The conversations through which this was negotiated are identified as a discourse of kingship. By discourse I mean, after Foucault, a 'group of statements that belong to a single system of formation', which can be identified and described, and which 'is, from beginning to end, historical – a fragment of history, a unity and discontinuity in history itself'.¹⁴ Existing scholarship on ancient kingship has tended to focus predominantly on its practice, whether on historical archaic kingship, or the later Hellenistic forms of monarchy, or on the negative form of tyranny. But analysing the positive accounts of kingship that are offered by fifth- and fourth-century thinkers, and which predate the practices of Hellenistic kingship, provides a richer picture of the metaphysical function of kingship in Greek political thought and culture.

Imaginary kings and founders filled an important symbolic space akin to the 'place vide' identified by Claude Lefort in his analysis of the symbolism of revolutionary France. Lefort saw the need for a modern, non-monarchical society to find a symbol to replace the embodiment of unified society that the monarch of the pre-modern regime represented.¹⁵ Athenian democracy, as a non-monarchic but pre-modern regime, solved this problem both institutionally, through the continuing democratic office of the *basileus archon*, whose holder stood in for the absent king in the administration and performance of religious ceremony, and culturally, through the continuing representation of the founder kings in civic art, such as temple friezes and wall paintings in public buildings, and performances such as

those at the dramatic festivals.¹⁶ The presence of Athenian kings such as Theseus and Erechtheus as characters on the tragic stage ensured their continuing representation in civic dialogue and ceremonial occasions, through the performance and retelling of political myth.¹⁷

This book investigates contributions to the discourse of kingship made by historians, dramatists, orators, philosophers and other writers whose works resist generic classification during the classical period of Athenian democracy from the mid-fifth to late fourth century BCE; most of the texts it considers were written in Athens or by authors significantly engaged with Athenian politics and society. Changes within the Athenian discourse of kingship during the classical period reveal changes in the broader political culture. Kingship could represent the unity of the polis, the achievement of individual excellence or, in the figure of the democratic king, an idealisation of the Athenian citizen as political and religious actor.¹⁸ Anthropologists have suggested that kingship originated in ritual, with those chosen as king performing specific functions for societies, including being sacrificed or exiled to ensure their continuity.¹⁹ This might result in a special connection between kings and the divine or cosmic order, but as Declan Quigley notes, it is the institution of kingship not the king himself that is sacred.²⁰

Just as mediaeval kings embodied a role of theological complexity and importance, ancient kings were imagined as having a role which imitated that of creator gods, establishing political order in line with cosmic order; while the theological framework of the two bodies that mediaeval thinkers constructed to explain kingship was absent from ancient thought, ancient thought on kingship suggests a political cosmology akin to the political theology of the mediaeval world.²¹

Kings could be compared with current political leaders and to theorists themselves; mythical Theseus and his labours became symbols for the intellectual endeavours of historical, but mythicised Socrates (Plato, *Phaedo*) and Isocrates (*Helen*).²² But the conflation of city and king was problematic; the king represents the city not as a part of the city, but as its whole, simultaneously creating and representing its unity. The personification with which king stands in for city is not a straightforward literary device, and it is never enough to say that the use of kingship language, or the appearance of a king representing his city, is metaphorical.²³ The complex relationship between king and city, and questions about the ontological or epistemic status of the king, contribute to a developing debate in which metaphysical questions are explored by many writers, and not just philosophers.

The classic version of a history of Athenian political thought focused on responses to Athenian democracy is Josiah Ober's *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens*, which fits most of Athens' major political theorists of the period into an analytical framework of criticism of democracy and democratic practices.²⁴ Ober's readings, however, in emphasising responses to democracy, underplay important themes that are developed especially in the later writers he examines, Isocrates and Aristotle; for them, response to kingship is much more than the engagement with contemporary Macedonian kingship that he suggests.²⁵

A series of other views of Greek political culture, which in turn deserve critical evaluation, underpin the focus on Athenian democratic thought. Firstly, the appeal

to the Greek mode of argument through polarity and binary opposition has been over-extended to suggest that the gap between 'Greeks' and 'others' is impermeable, and that Greek political thought is founded on the rejection of non-Greek modes of rule such as the type of monarchy identified in Carolyn Dewald's 'despotic template'.²⁶ Understanding arguments based on polarity as enabling comparison rather than simply rejection is more helpful in interpreting analyses such as Herodotus' exploration of monarchy in different ancient empires.²⁷ Herodotus' presentation and analysis of key monarchs (Chapter 1) provides a foundational source book for Athenian political theorists in their analysis of kingship, especially Xenophon, Plato and Aristotle, as the later chapters of this book show. Nino Luraghi accounts for the fourth-century discourse of kingship by interpreting it as an inversion of the 'despotic template' discourse of tyranny, but this fails to account satisfactorily for the positive accounts of kingship in Herodotus and tragedy, and the later appropriations of them.²⁸ Likewise, Henning Börm identifies an 'antimonarchic discourse' in Greek thought, in which the rule of the individual was 'fundamentally contrary to the central norms of the world of the polis'.²⁹ By understanding Herodotus' presentation of kingship as retaining and exploring elements of the cosmic model of ancient kingship, linked to his interest in cosmology, the otherwise puzzling positive aspects of Herodotus' accounts of founder kings regain a purpose.

Secondly, the Philhellenist idea that classical Athens (or Greece, more broadly) exemplifies a 'Greek enlightenment' or even Greek 'miracle', as an exceptional, advanced society distinct from the world that surrounded it through its adoption of rational and secular thought, should be challenged.³⁰ When adherents to this perspective seek to exclude the mythical and non-rational from consideration, they risk serious misinterpretation of key texts, as much political argument is carried out through the sophisticated use of non-rationalised modes of discourse such as myth. Excluding these from analysis may distort the interpretation of writers, such as Herodotus and Isocrates, who make extensive use of mythical argument. The persistence of archaic ideas about kingship within Greek political thought, and the use of civic mythology to instantiate kingship within the collective imaginary of the polis, suggest that Greek political thought represents a pre-modern response to a pre-modern political situation, albeit one that persists in modern states that retain monarchy to provide symbolic unity.³¹ The Greek analysis of kingship, and the possibility of replicating the attributes of the cosmic king within the largely non-monarchical setting of the Greek polis, is more sophisticated and more thorough, and more attentive to exemplars from the Ancient Near East, than classical scholars, keen to present Greek and its political culture as a unique and independent development, have previously suggested.

A third difficulty is caused by a focus on historical political institutions as a means of understanding Athenian politics. Ancient political theory was not necessarily conducted through the analysis of institutions and situations, but presented in mythical settings that would be familiar to Athenian citizens. In Athens, drama exemplifies this process, but Plato and Isocrates, among others, use myth for political analysis and argument, and it becomes especially important in 'Lycurgan'

Athens. As the fourth century BCE progressed, interest in mythical and historical monarchs, as well as in contemporary rulers of Macedon, Syracuse and elsewhere, became more prominent in Greek political thinking, seen in Lycurgus' speeches and in texts of less certain authorship, such as the pseudo-Platonic *Minos* and *Alcibiades*.³²

Recent scholarship has begun to address these difficulties and create more nuanced explorations of classical Greek thought and practice, positioning Greek culture within its context of the ancient Mediterranean world rather than seeking to present it as something exceptional.³³ Vincent Azoulay has argued that the character of Athenian democracy changed during the classical period, and particularly the fourth century, with a growing emphasis on the individual.³⁴ Greek kingship itself has received renewed attention; Lynette Mitchell explores the prevalence of various forms of monarchic rule in archaic and classical Greece, while Nino Luraghi's collection examines kingship at the start of the Hellenistic era.³⁵ Kathryn Morgan has explored the analysis and account of monarchy contained within Pindar's victory odes, written for fifth-century Sicilian tyrants.³⁶ Stefan Rebenich's collection explores monarchy across many cultures of the ancient and mediaeval worlds, including classical Greece.³⁷

Greek political thought on kingship was never restricted to examining the arrangements of the cities of mainland Greece. Xenophon and Aristotle both look forward to the political arrangements of the kingdoms of the Hellenistic world in their examination of kingship outside the polis, as shown by Christopher Tuplin and others.³⁸ Xenophon's and Aristotle's monarchical thought has also been presented in terms of leadership (rather than kingship) in broader contexts.³⁹ The centrality of monarchical images of leaders as shepherds and fathers to political discourse has been demonstrated by Roger Brock.⁴⁰

My first step is to take a broad overview of the varied locations of the discourse of kingship in ancient Greek thought.⁴¹ Political treatises (of which there are few) are just one of its locations, and its presence in texts from many genres, beginning in the fifth century with Herodotus' histories (Chapter 1), and Athenian drama, both tragedy and comedy (Chapter 2), demonstrate its importance. Historiographic, rhetorical and philosophical repurposing of the mythical past becomes its key site in the fourth century for Isocrates (Chapters 3 and 5), the Socratics (Chapter 4), Xenophon (Chapters 4 and 5), Plato (Chapter 6) and Aristotle (Chapter 7).

My second step is to read these works as engagements with the political imaginary and the production of political myth within a changing and developing philosophical discourse, an approach supported by anthropological models of kingship such as that of Graeber and Sahlins. While Castoriadis conceives of the political imaginary as a collective product of democracy and its autonomous citizens, with his emphasis on fifth-century democracy he under-emphasises the continuing contest for control of this imaginary within the Athenian polity, particularly the anti-democratic arguments of the fourth-century theorists.⁴² In the context of fourth-century Athens, this contest included the replacement of democratic elements with non-democratic ones, such as the reassignment of canonical great deeds of the Athenians from the collective citizenry to the hero-king Theseus

(Chapter 3). While the practice and theory of Athenian democracy solved the demand for equal participation by full citizen members of the polis, acknowledging the equality of citizens and enabling political participation by citizens on an equal basis, the idea of the unity of the polis was less easily constructed within a purely democratic discourse, providing a continuing function for kingship myths.⁴³ Even historical kings created an imaginary presence while secluding themselves, as Lindsay Allan has shown in respect of the secluded Achaemenid kings with their powerful iconography.⁴⁴

Individual fourth-century writers sought to influence the imaginary or even to control it through the act of retelling the myths that are central to civic identity, moving the location of debate from the public settings of Athenian drama (and the civic iconography that decorated major public buildings) into the literary works of Plato, Xenophon and Isocrates (Chapters 3–6). Writers attempted to change the signification of characters such as Ion and Theseus by retelling their stories, expecting familiarity with the existing discourse. Retellings may alter genealogies, rationalise magical elements in the story, attribute deeds to different actors (especially the reattribution of collective deeds to individuals), and reorient an existing narrative to support a new ideological claim. Myth as such is characterised by its lack of fixed form and by constant retelling, which distinguishes it from other forms of narrative such as fiction. In treating the ancient debates on kingship as a process of retelling political myths, I draw on a range of established scholarship on modern political myth and the invention of tradition.⁴⁵

There is an extensive body of scholarship on political myth in modern contexts, but little agreement on the application of this to the ancient world, despite its prevalence as a source of examples; Henry Tudor, for example, regards political myth as ‘a feature of advanced societies’, although Cicero’s use of Roman foundation myth (which he himself treats as history) provides one of his case studies.⁴⁶ Political myth has been defined by Tudor as ‘one which tells the story of a political society’; this may be oriented to the future or the past, but ‘is always the myth of a particular group’.⁴⁷ Tudor regards political myths as having collective protagonists; individuals appear as representatives of that group (as Theseus *qua* democratic king). Most importantly he identifies political myth as ‘not only an explanation, but also a practical argument’.⁴⁸

Christopher Flood takes care to position political myth between sacred myth and political ideology, distinguishing it from the former by its secular status (although it is something which is believed), and from the latter (of which it is a sub-set) by its narrative mode. Political myths are ‘vehicles of ideological beliefs and . . . supports for ideological arguments’; this perspective enables Flood to define political myths as ideologically marked accounts that are in competition.⁴⁹

Flood’s and Tudor’s distinction between ‘political’ myth (the province of political theorists working on modern societies) and ‘sacred’ myth (the province of anthropologists studying pre-modern world) sets them against the earlier work of Ernst Cassirer, who saw political myth as the intrusion of the sacred into the secular and a retrograde step in human development.⁵⁰ While Cassirer idealised Greece as the first society in which *mythos* was resisted by *logos*, his exploration

of the propaganda function of modern political myth can illuminate the study of ancient political myth.⁵¹

My third methodological step is to consider the function of symbolic language in creating powerful associations for kingship in ancient thought, seen in the rich language of tragedy and the persistent imagery of kingship in prose texts that associate kingship terms with processes of cosmic ordering and other positive values. Kingship is endowed with what Paul Ricoeur has described as a ‘surplus of meaning’; it can be seen as a structural or cognitive metaphor.⁵² Reading these texts without acknowledging the weight of surplus meaning in the discourse of kingship leads to anachronistic realist readings, particularly of Xenophon’s thought on kingship (Chapter 6).⁵³

Although my focus is the fifth- and fourth-century discourse of kingship, this draws upon a rich heritage of earlier thought from across the Greek world, which contributes to the development of both the imaginary spaces of myth and the surplus meaning of kingship.⁵⁴ In earlier epic texts, the ideal king is located in an imaginary setting, expressed through simile and *ekphrasis*, in which he is endowed with powerful characteristics.⁵⁵ In the *Odyssey*, the returning but un-recognised Odysseus uses the good king as a simile while addressing Penelope and praising her capabilities (*Od.* 19.109–14). This king reinstantiates something resembling the golden age, causing both fruitfulness in crops and flocks (111–13) and virtue among the people (‘the people are excellent through him’, ἀρετῶσι δὲ λαοὶ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, 114).⁵⁶ He exhibits piety (θεουδής, 109), and ‘provides justice’ (εὐδικίας ἀνέχῃσι, 111) and good leadership (ἐξ εὐηγείης, 114). This utopia exists only in the imagination of Odysseus, here identified as ‘cunning’ (πολύμητις, 106); likewise, in the *Iliad*, the royal sanctuary (τέμενος βασιλῆϊον, 18.550) on the shield of Achilles exists outside the separate world of its contrasting good and bad cities, its silent king a puzzling presence in an epic world where the authority of the king is established in significant part by his speaking ability.⁵⁷

The golden-age king and the abundance he generates are contested within epic; Hesiod’s kings offer both positive and negative paradigms of monarchic rule. Hesiod’s *Theogony* connects human kings to the divine through their nourishment by the Muses, as Zeus’ daughters, which renders them ‘wise’ (ἐχέφρονες, 88) and ‘like a god’ (ὥς θεόν, 91).⁵⁸ Kings are recipients of divine and unusual wisdom that enables them to discharge two key leadership functions, speaking well and judging well (*Theogony* 84–92), skills not possessed by the crooked majority; this extends to kings being able to alter the course of events, ‘easily turn events around’ (μετάτροπα ἔργα τελεῦσι/ρήϊδιως, 89–90).⁵⁹ The honeyed speech of kings effects change in the community, in contrast to that of poets, which only affects individuals.⁶⁰

However, Hesiod’s *Works and Days* describes conflict between this ideal order, and its actual delivery in the human world.⁶¹ The potential for good kingship and good judgement remains, but the *basileis* of *Works and Days* are notable for their failings; they are bribable ‘gift-eaters’ (38–9), a term Hesiod later associates with crooked judgements (221).⁶² Dike herself recognises the corruption of kings (256–64), and Zeus sees the injustice that is taking place (265–73). The poetic

voice outperforms the political one, in the fable of the hawk and the nightingale.⁶³ Good judgement falls instead to the singer, Hesiod himself, who, according to André Laks, becomes an ‘ancestor of the philosopher-king’.⁶⁴ The model of the divinely inspired king who governs well is contested through the negative counter-examples, forerunners of the tyrants of later histories and dramas.

The over-riding characteristic of the kings of ancient Greek thought is their link with unity and processes of unification. The positive association that this confers on kings often outweighs negative values that might contribute to a ‘despotic template’ interpretation. The king represents the unity of the polis, a symbolic link found in foundation myths and stories of refoundation or synoecism. The one king brings together the many citizens, transforming their villages into a polis.⁶⁵ For Athens, Theseus plays this role and unites the separate villages created in Cecrops’ original foundation; democratic reforms such as Cleisthenes’ could be characterised by anti-democratic critics as dismantling this unity. The symbolic relationship between monarch and polis also appears in myths where kings sacrifice themselves (or their daughters) to preserve the unity and security of the polis, as in Euripides’ *Erechtheus* or Lycurgus’ story of Codrus.⁶⁶ Kings have a special relationship with the city as a unified entity, going back to the ‘cosmic’ or sacral king of non-Greek ancient societies.⁶⁷

But kings also imply separation and distinction from their subjects, a difference of quality or of kind. The king is different from the citizens, a difference that legitimises kings’ authority whether it is expressed as an ontological distinction (divine king, human subjects), an epistemological one (the king possesses superior knowledge, inaccessible to his subjects, whether of divine or human matters) or an ethical one (the king possesses personal characteristics superior to those of the citizens). As Luraghi notes, this makes kingship a difficult concept within the egalitarian ideology of the polis; Aristotle and Xenophon explore this (Chapters 5 and 7), with Aristotle’s account of an extreme version of kingship, *pambasileia*, drawing together and exploring problems of both cosmic and virtue models of kingship.⁶⁸ Aristotle exposes the mereological problems of kingship that the creation of the polis sets up: Is the king a part of the city, set over it or a symbolic representation of its entirety and unity?

By focusing on the debate about kingship, we may clarify the connections between the works of fourth-century theorists, their use of their fifth-century heritage and the structure of their political arguments and the models of monarchy that they constructed. Throughout this debate, the distinctive position of the king within Greek political ontology remains clear, although the grounds for distinguish him vary.

Notes

- 1 On the announcement of the new era name, and discussion of its traditional and innovative aspects, see these news reports: Foster 2019; Osaki and Murakami 2019. On the history of Japanese monarchy, see Packard 1988.
- 2 See for example Davies 2019. On the gendered dimensions of the fascination with royal bodies see Mantel 2013.

10 Introduction

- 3 The concept originates in Jaspers 1953; for discussion, see the essays in Bellah and Joas 2012, especially Dalferth and Taylor. For a classicist perspective see Brisson 2016.
- 4 Strathern 2019: 155–73.
- 5 Graeber 2017b: 416–19.
- 6 Dalferth 2012: 147–8.
- 7 Hoekstra 2016; Nippel 2017: 248–52. The figure of the Greek tyrant has been used to criticise contemporary politicians, as in Allen 2016.
- 8 Strauss 2013; Newell 2013.
- 9 K. Olson 2016: 40, describing Castoriadis 1987, 1991, 1997.
- 10 Taylor 2004: 23. The exploration of the Athenian political imaginary is central to the work of Nicole Loraux (especially Loraux 1981, cf. Loraux 1976); the concept is increasingly used by scholars to explore the political psychologies of the ancient world (e.g. Balot 2014: 17, 182).
- 11 While Aristotle distinguishes the monarchical (*basilikon*) and the political (*politikon*), he retains an interest in the kingly rule of non-polis societies (*ethnē*), presented as an opposition of past and present at *Pol.* 1.2.1252b19–20. On Greek ethnography as a persistent form of cultural enquiry, see Skinner 2012.
- 12 Sahlins and Graeber 2017: 12. On the relationship between monarchy and popular sovereignty in the form of ‘popular tyranny’ in classical Athens, see Hoekstra 2016.
- 13 To use the term for divine figures used by Sahlins and Graeber 2017: 4, 7–11.
- 14 Foucault 1976: 107, 17.
- 15 Lefort 2007; Lefort 1988: 16–19, with further exploration of the ‘permanence of the theologico-political’ as an ‘irreducible element’ in politics at 213–55.
- 16 Ar. [*Ath. Pol.*] 3.2–5, 47.4, 57; Rhodes 1993: 98–105, 636–9, Vidal-Naquet 2002: xvi–xvii. On the representation of Theseus in Athenian public buildings, see Hoff 2010; Neils 1987.
- 17 Rebenich and Wienand 2017: 12–15 emphasises the centrality of representative performance to the continuance of the discourse of kingship.
- 18 Cf. Kantorowicz 1957 on the political theology of mediaeval kingship.
- 19 The relationship between the institution of kingship and the role of the sacrificial king has been much contested since it was first proposed by Frazer, writing about the kings of the Shilluk in the Sudan, and then criticised by Evans-Pritchard (Evans-Pritchard 1948; Frazer 1911). Anthropologists have queried whether Frazer’s model relied too much on classical myth, but more recent scholarship has reasserted some of his ideas: see Quigley 2005; Schnepel 1988.
- 20 Quigley 2005: 2; see also David Graeber’s essay on kingship sacred and divine (Graeber 2017b).
- 21 Graeber suggests that Kantorowicz’s model underlies Evans-Pritchard’s critique of Frazer’s model of divine kingship (Evans-Pritchard 1948; Sahlins and Graeber 2017: 67–71). While some elements of Carl Schmitt’s thought on sovereignty and political theology may also be applicable here, his analysis is more closely connected to the conditions of the modern world (Schmitt 2005).
- 22 Pl. *Phd.* 58a10–c5 introduces the theme of Theseus and his voyage to the dialogue, in which Socrates’ own intellectual journey will be likened to a pair of voyages.
- 23 Although the rich use of monarchical imagery in Greek political language can be analysed in literary terms, and instances categorised as synecdoche or metonym according to various schemes (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 35–40; Ricoeur 2003: 63–8), the relation of founder to founded makes the identification of part to whole or part with whole richer and more involved, and helps to set up the mereological puzzle of the metaphysics of monarchy; see n.48 below.
- 24 Ober 1998.
- 25 Ober 1998: 347–51.
- 26 Dewald 2003: 27–32. See also Cartledge 2002b: 75–7.
- 27 Whereas understanding the structural form of such arguments, and the metaphysical models underpinning them, is useful in considering the opposition between unity and plurality replicated in typologies of constitutions. Cf. Lloyd 1966.

- 28 Luraghi 2013a: 18–20.
- 29 Börm 2015: 13, cf. Luraghi 2015.
- 30 Vernant 1982: 38–48, cf. Adorno and Horkheimer 1986; Cassirer 1946: 53–60.
- 31 For explorations of ‘cosmic’ kingship and its anthropology in ancient societies of the Near East see Frankfort 1948; Hocart 1927, and more recently, an overview of kingship from Oakley 2006 and on the politics of divine kingship Sahlins and Graeber 2017: 377–464. Whether kings were in themselves divine, or the focus of a society’s communication with the divine, is much contested, with evidence from different societies suggesting different interpretations. While Frankfort argues that non-Egyptian ancient kings did not assume divinity, a view supported by De Heusch (Heusch 1987: 249–55), but disputed by David Graeber (Sahlins and Graeber 2017: 72–3). Analysis of the imagery of, for example, Achaemenid kingship suggests that there was ambiguity and equivocation on this topic (see Root 1979, 2013).
- 32 This process takes place even before Macedonian regents of Athens begin to assert the paraphernalia of kingship (on which see Thonemann 2005 on Demetrios Poliorketes’ self-representation).
- 33 Cf. Gruen 2010, 2011.
- 34 Azoulay 2006.
- 35 Luraghi 2013b; Mitchell 2013. The relationship between classical Greek models of kingship and Hellenistic kingship becomes more clear when the continuing Greek interest in near-Eastern states and empires is incorporated into an understanding of Greek political thought; see also Hekster and Fowler 2005.
- 36 Morgan 2015.
- 37 Rebenich 2017; see especially Nippel 2017; Körner 2017.
- 38 Gray 2011c; Tuplin 2013.
- 39 Newell 2013; Sandridge 2012.
- 40 Brock 2013: 43–52.
- 41 Stroheker 1954 surveys a similar selection of texts but treats monarchical theory as an innovation of fifth-century sophists.
- 42 Ober 1998 remains the most detailed account of anti-democratic thought in Athens, but does not consider the symbolic role of monarchy in Athenian political myth.
- 43 Calame 1996; Gotteland 2001.
- 44 L. Allan 2005.
- 45 Blumenberg 1985 identifies the continuing ‘work on myth’ as endowing names with significance; Hobsbawm 1983 points to the continuing practice of seeking legitimacy for ideas or actions by positioning them in an idealised past; in the same volume, David Cannadine examines the nineteenth-century invention of British monarchical ‘tradition’ (1983: 103–8).
- 46 Cic. *Rep.* 2, Tudor 1972. Cicero shows that the interrelationship between foundation myth and history remained fluid.
- 47 Tudor 1972: 138–9.
- 48 Tudor 1972: 139.
- 49 Flood 1996: 42.
- 50 Cassirer 1946: 3–5.
- 51 Cassirer 1946: 53–60; Cassirer’s purpose, like Adorno and Horkheimer’s, is to examine the rise of German nationalism and the resurgence of political myth, cf. Bottici 2007: 151–9; Flood 1996: 257–74.
- 52 Ricoeur 1976: 45–6. Ricoeur also argues (2003: 337) that persistent ‘dead’ metaphors create this ‘linguistic surplus value’. Indeed, the ideas of hierarchy and power present in the structures of metaphorical systems make their two-way application to and of kingship challenging to disentangle.
- 53 Bourdieu 1991: 163–70.
- 54 Herodotus’ broad scope introduces many ideas to Athenian thinkers; Pindar’s negotiations with his powerful clients provide another source of comparators and analysis (Fr. 169, Hornblower 2006; Stroheker 1954: 393–5).

12 Introduction

- 55 Schofield 1986: 11–12 regards the *Odyssey* 19 and *Iliad* Shield passages as ‘anachronistic’ and excludes them from his analysis of *euboulia*. But reading them as evidence for the discourse of kingship and its location in the distinct space and time of the imaginary dissolves this difficulty.
- 56 Hesiod describes a similar city, but without monarchical rule (Hes. *Op.* 225–37).
- 57 Oliver Taplin suggests that the characters long for this idyllic location (1980: 8, 13). L’Orange 1953: 90–102 explores this and examples from Achaemenid art as the representation of the cosmos on a shield, a motif he shows persisting into Roman and Byzantine art.
- 58 W. Allan 2006; Clay 2003.
- 59 Stoddard 2003.
- 60 Laks 1996: 86–7.
- 61 Clay 2003: 74; Solmsen 1954.
- 62 W. Allan 2006; Ogden 1997.
- 63 For Plato, the tyrannical face reincarnation as wolves, hawks and kites (Pl. *Phd.* 82a4–6).
- 64 Laks 1996: 91.
- 65 Athens’ Synoikia festival celebrated this; Parker 1996: 14, 2007: 480–1.
- 66 Kearns 1990.
- 67 See Scubla 2005; de Heusch 1997 for responses to the anthropological scholarship of Frazer, Hocart and Girard (Girard 2013: 285–312) on the foundational connection between kingship and ritual.
- 68 Luraghi 2013a: 20–2.

1 King and cosmos in Herodotus

‘It would seem that nothing is better than one man, the best’, claims Darius, leader of a conspiracy of Persian nobles against the government of a usurper, as he and his fellow conspirators debate the way in which Persia should be governed after they have seized power (Hdt. 3.82.3). His point is a counter to the claims for democracy, the rule of the many, advanced by Otanes, and for aristocracy, the rule of the few, advanced by Megabyzus. The advantages of monarchy, as Darius sees it, are the advantages of unity and unification; it is also the inevitable outcome of all civil strife, as a strong leader emerges from the contenders. Past experience has been that such a leader delivered freedom (3.82.5); monarchy is a necessary stage in the political cycle.

The presence of this debate in Herodotus’ account of the history of Persia has been deemed an anachronism, an interpolation of sophistic ideas and debate more appropriate to the government of the classical Greek polis than the contested rule over the Persians from a century earlier.¹ It offers an important summary of early Greek political thinking, but much scholarship has focused on Otanes’ positive account of *isonomia* (as he terms democracy) and his critique of single-person rule, described by Carolyn Dewald as a ‘despotic template’, and expanded by Nino Luraghi into a ‘discourse of tyranny’.² But Darius’ presentation of monarchy distills a detailed model of one-man rule, developed by Herodotus from sources including the stories of culture heroes and founders, the ideas of Presocratic philosophers, and the histories and ideas of non-Greek cultures, precariously transmitted but recognisable in a series of exemplary accounts of the strengths and weaknesses of monarchy. It may also echo Persian thought on kingship, expressed by Darius himself in a range of inscriptions attached to monuments, from the cliff face at Bisitun to his royal tomb at Naqsh-e Rostam.³ The picture of kingship Herodotus derives from both Greek and Persian sources offers an ideal that his diverse rulers largely fail to meet. But this model is more than the reverse of the image of the tyrant. Rather, it summarises the Persian ideology of kingship presented in their inscribed proclamations.⁴

The investigation of forms of political rule and governance dominates Herodotus’ complex literary enterprise: this includes the forms it takes in different types of society, Greek and non-Greek, the impact of different individuals within the role of ruler, and which form is the best choice for a particular society. His evaluative

criteria include how forms of rule instantiate good cosmic order within societies, and whether rulers increase or decrease their empire. Yet Darius' closing speech also summarises important ancient thought, Greek and non-Greek, on the benefits of monarchy. It restates the central point of ideas of ancient kingship, that certain individuals are capable of transforming their society from disordered plurality to ordered unity, and that such action is a necessary stage within the cycle of human affairs. Yet in Darius' version, this heroic figure's actions result in a better alignment of society with the ordering of the cosmos, confounding the distinction between cosmic kings (who mediate with or represent divinity) and heroic kings (legitimised by their personal excellence) drawn by Alan Strathern in his development of the Axial Age model.⁵

This chapter first examines the disparate sources of Herodotus' models of monarchy – the ideas of Herodotus' philosophical contemporaries, the stories of rulers from the range of countries in contact with Persia, traditional stories about rulers – and identifies some of its features – the concern with knowledge, the exploration of the ambiguous border between good and bad monarchical rule, the peculiar status of women. It then uses the model to read three key stories from the non-Greek societies Herodotus studies, and closes by examining the way in which the kingship model works within the Greek world itself. It shows how Herodotus' histories contain many accounts of the roles of kings as 'metahuman' figures (in Marshall Sahlin's terminology) transforming the structure of their societies and the relations of their societies with the cosmos.⁶

Herodotus' exemplary narratives of kings and tyrants further his project of exploring the different power structures generated by the practices of the Greeks and barbarians, raised first in the opening 'Logos of Croesus' (1.6–94) and subsequently in the story of the empire constructed by Cyrus and his heirs, until Xerxes' climactic encounter with the cities of mainland Greece and defeat by their forces.⁷ Within this overall structure, his stories of Deioces, Psammetichus and Amasis should be read as political myths that explore the conditions under which political unity and stability can come into being and be maintained.⁸ Herodotus also examines monarchy in the Greek world, from the traditional dual kingship of Sparta to the tyrannies of cities. Throughout his work, Herodotus brings in a range of ideas from Presocratic philosophers such as Heraclitus and Empedocles, as well as ideas and modes of argumentation from sophistic sources, but in analysing non-Greek models of cosmic kingship he also engages with the ideas and presentation of monarchical power that he finds beyond the Greek world, especially those in Egypt and Persia.

Herodotus' 'monarchical model' and the 'despotic template'

That Herodotus' focus on the deeds of kings and tyrants displays an interest in the workings of power under monarchy has long been acknowledged.⁹ Henry Immerwahr showed that stories of the rise and fall of kings, especially those of Cyrus and his successors, provide an important structuring element in the work, and more recent readings have emphasised the role of political analysis in the work.¹⁰

In the 'despotic template' model, Herodotus' exploration of monarchy as a dissection of oriental despotism is based on a template located within Otanes' criticism of monarchy (3.80.2–5).¹¹ While Otanes starts by criticising 'monarchy' and the idea of 'a single monarch' (3.80.2–3), he moves on to identify this monarch as 'a tyrant' (3.80.4), as his detailed picture of the abuses of tyranny builds up, and in line with the debate's focus on the worst aspects of each form of rule. Lateiner presents a Herodotus who focuses on the negatives of single-person rule, particularly the loss of individual freedom, closely aligning him with the views he gives to Otanes.¹² Rosaria Munson, drawing on this model, regards monarchy as holding 'powerful negative connotations' for Herodotus.¹³ Other scholars have developed nuanced versions of the model which acknowledge both that Herodotean tyrants can rule well, and that Herodotean kings are not all failures. Tom Harrison observes the variety and interest of Herodotus' exploration of Egyptian kingship, suggesting that Egypt provides 'an archive of the "dos and don'ts" of kingship'.¹⁴ John Gammie, although his analysis largely corresponds to the 'despotic template' model, shows that Herodotus transcends it in his positive depiction of select monarchs.¹⁵ Katherine Clarke shows how the manipulation of the natural and built environment by Herodotus' kings and tyrants materialises their power.¹⁶

Luraghi argues that Herodotus distinguishes between one-man rule in the context of the Greek polis and in non-Greek '*ethnos* states', as Greek writers identified non-Greek peoples whose societies were not structured as poleis, such as the kingdom of Egypt.¹⁷ While Luraghi is right to see commonalities in the 'misery of ruling alone', and to emphasise the role of the mythical imaginary in shaping accounts of tyranny, his reduction of the 'ideology of monarchy' to 'the personality of the ruler' fails to account for the metaphysical underpinnings of ancient models of kingship, which can explain the potency of mythical elements in these stories.

The 'despotic template' or 'discourse of tyranny' model, or a simple reversal of the attributes it lists, cannot account for the positive attributes of the cosmic king and their relationship to positive phases of the political cycle, and likewise the connection of the despotic elements to its negative phases. While Herodotus' writing largely precedes the development of the sixfold constitutional model, in which rule by one, few or many can come in good or bad forms, his exploration of monarchy presupposes both good and bad forms, as well as the possibility of transition between them, or liminal cases of uncertain status.¹⁸ Although the actions of a good king, at least in Darius' version, are crucial for the establishment of a secure community, Herodotus elsewhere suggests that monarchy is not the only form of rule that can do this, with his positive evaluation of the impact of the advent of democracy on the fortunes of Athens (5.78).¹⁹

Herodotus' use of his monarchical exemplars is much more nuanced than the 'despotic template' model permits, through his analysis of non-Greek models of cosmic and divine monarchy.²⁰ By distinguishing between kingship and tyranny, and using his cyclical model, he shows that founder monarchs bring political unity and stability to regions, enabling their inhabitants to take care of their own business rather than struggle for survival (1.97.3).²¹ Monarchs endowed (by themselves or others) with divine status, or whose authority is provided by divine support, and accepted by their

subjects as such, might be different from the secular tyrant whose rule is maintained by force alone. By building this model through telling political myths about the careers and personal lives of kings and tyrants, Herodotus provides a framework within which his central non-Greek characters, Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes, can be evaluated, and against which Xerxes' failures in the Persian War narrative can be assessed. Herodotus' sources for these stories are for the most part unknown, but the narrative shapes and patterns suggest to Chris Pelling that his narrative contains 'less of the real Persian court or even of real stories' but rather a 'Greek construct'.²²

Differentiating kings and tyrants

Herodotus' interest in cosmic patterns and the metaphysics of monarchy leads him to assess his positive-phase monarchs using different criteria from those that apply to the negative part of the cycle, where Otanes' 'despotic template' operates (3.80.2–5). Instead, he uses ideas briefly summarised in Darius' template for good kingship (3.82.2–4), although expressed more fully in the kingship narratives explored next. These characteristics permit the differentiation of the good king from the bad tyrant in terms of their performance within a single framework, enabling borderline cases to be explored. While Lynette Mitchell argues that there is a single historical phenomenon under which *basileia* and *tyrannis* can be subsumed, Herodotus' narrative largely separates the two into distinct sub-types, if not clear opposites.²³

In his narrative, Herodotus takes a functional approach to identifying monarchs as *turannos* (tyrant) or *basileus* (king). Rulers are differentiated and labelled by the type of power they exercise, based on its origins, or by Herodotus' assessment of their political and ethical behaviour.²⁴ It is only within the speeches of the constitutional debate that the term is used to evaluate other rulers, who might elsewhere in the histories be termed *basileis*. In dialogue within the histories, the choice of terms demonstrates the speaker's perspective. Subservience or politeness to a tyrant, or one's own tyrannical point of view, may result in the decision to use the title *basileus*; no one in the *Histories* is directly addressed as *turanne*.²⁵ Arthur Ferrill has also shown that Herodotus represents the usage of the terms as decided ideologically by speakers, as in 5.44 when Telys, the tyrant/king of the Sybarites, is described as *basileus* by his own side and *turannos* by the people of Croton, which he is attacking.²⁶ The overlap between the categories of *basileus* and *turannos* first appears in Herodotus' discussion of Candaules of Lydia, to whom he applies both kingship and tyranny vocabulary, without an apparent change of focalisation.²⁷ But it appears in other tyranny stories too: Periander describes himself as *basileus* (3.52.4) while trying to persuade his son Lycophron to return to his household; although he extols the benefits of holding *turannis*, his daughter argues that 'tyranny is a difficult thing, though many desire it' (τυραννις χρήμα σφαλερόν, πολλοὶ δὲ αὐτῆς ἐρασταὶ εἰσι, 3.53.4), and that it is dangerous to those people.²⁸

Kings may be of different types. One type of *basileus* exercises broad-ranging power over a large area or group of peoples; this type of monarch is exemplified by the Persian kings, Herodotus' ultimate examples of monarchy. But their power easily converts to abusive tyranny, such as Xerxes' whipping the Hellespont and

executing his engineers when his first bridge fails (7.34–5). Another type of *basileus* exerts more limited authority over smaller geographic units. In both cases, the role is typically transmitted within a family group, without any automatic inheritance. Accession may be competitive, and outsiders and marginal figures may seize power, as in the opening anecdote of Candaules and Gyges in Lydia (1.12.2–13.2).

Kings perform important religious functions; in some societies, the religious role of the king is more important than any political role. The dual kingship of Sparta shows how kings connect their societies to cosmic order. It might seem that having two kings loses the important figurehead of unity that the single ruler presents, but the Spartan dual-kingship system preserves a model of the cosmos as a dual system of earth and sky, linking the ruled to both.²⁹ Sparta's two royal houses held priesthoods of Zeus Lakedaimonios and Zeus Ouranios respectively (6.57); the pair of priesthoods, one focused Zeus as god on the land and one on Zeus as god of the heavens, neatly demonstrates the role of kings in linking cosmic and political order.³⁰ The presence of two kings in such systems does not counter the unificatory role of kingship that might be thought to require a single monarch. The archonship of classical Athens, with the separation of responsibilities between the eponymous archon and the *basileus* archon, preserves a similar function.³¹

In contrast, *turannis* denotes the exercise of political and military power by a ruler without the ordering and religious functions of a *basileus*. From its earliest appearance in a seventh-century BCE fragment of Archilochus (Fr. 19 West), *turannis* (tyranny) as a form of rule is linked to Greek conceptions of eastern rulers, wealth and greed, even when it is applied to single rulers in a polis context.³² A *basileus* may have or act with *turannis*, but a *turannos* does not have *basileia*; the power denoted by *turannis* is a limited sub-set of that contained by *basileia*. However, excessive interest in *turannis* is a negative quality in a *basileus*. Herodotus introduces his series of kingship narratives as an exploration of the negative progression 'from being self-governed . . . back to tyranny' (ἐόντων δὲ αὐτονόμων . . . αὐτίς ἐς τυραννίδα, 1.96.1) in the case of the Medes under Deioces. The exercise of power by a *basileus* outside the limits within which it should be operated (as when kings cross rivers and breach their territory) also marks a transition from the legitimate to the illegitimate exercise of power, from kingship to tyranny.

The *basileus* takes responsibility for creating and maintaining order within his kingdom, whereas the *turannos* is more simply interested in maintaining personal, political and military control. Deioces, Herodotus' first model king, establishes a kind of cosmic ordering in his kingdom of Media (1.97–8). But tyrants can also establish good order: Herodotus praises the sixth-century Peisistratids of Athens for generating order. He notes that Peisistratus 'arranged the city beautifully and well' (κοσμέων καλῶς τε καὶ εὖ, 1.59.6).

Kings, custom and order: Herodotus and Heraclitus

Herodotus' thoughts on kingship and cosmic order draw on philosophical ideas circulating in his time in his home region of Ionia. Darius' exposition of good kingship, for example, contains echoes of the thought of Heraclitus, who was active

around 500 BCE, and lived under Persian rule in the Ionian city of Ephesus. It is hard to reconstruct a detailed political theory from the surviving fragments of Heraclitus' gnomic and enigmatic philosophical writing, although political language features strongly within them, and the ancient biographical tradition treats him as a political writer (Diogenes Laertius 9.1.6).³³ Given his political and geographical situation, it is not surprising that Heraclitus' work displays knowledge of cosmological thought from non-Greek traditions.³⁴

Kingship is a key concept for this 'frankly monarchical' (Geoffrey Lloyd) thinker, predominantly as an analogy for explaining structural and hierarchical relationships between elements of the cosmos. Heraclitus' use of kingship language relates not as much to human kings as to the natural ordering principle of the cosmos; for example 'War is the father and king of all' (DK 22 B 53).³⁵ The control exercised by a child playing a board game over the pieces on the board is also described as kingship (Fr. 52: the use of board games as a metaphor for political and cosmic order is well-established).³⁶

Heraclitus is also concerned with the relationship between the divine law of the cosmos and the human law of the polis, a further example of the problematisation of *nomos* ('customary practice' or 'law') that drives early thought. The shared human *nomoi* of the city, for Heraclitus, are derived from a single, divine source, which rules them ('For all human *nomoi* are nurtured by the one divine [ἐνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ]', Fr. 114).³⁷ Heraclitus' *nomoi* are part of a divine cosmic order, even if that divine force is ambivalent about being anthropomorphised ('One thing, the only wise thing [ἐν τὸ σοφὸν μόνον], does not wish and wishes to be called the name of Zeus', Fr. 32).

These ideas illuminate Herodotus' cosmological model of kingship. Herodotus' kings and founders operate with a different status relative to the divine than that of their subjects. Kings have a closer affinity with the divine, receiving a greater share of divine attention, both positive and negative; this may be materialised in larger shares of sacrifice distributions, as with the Spartan kings (6.57.1). Herodotus' general focus on religion is often expressed through exploring interactions between kings and divinity, particularly those involving oracles. Rulers operate under the guidance of oracles, and ignore them at their peril. This applies to the existing rulers of empires but specifically to founders of new cities (such as Battus of Cyrene, and his descendants, identified as kings, 4.150–9). The Spartan kings manage interactions with the divine by controlling access to oracular divination at Delphi (6.57.2, 4).

The relationship between kingship, law and custom is a central problem for Herodotus. Gigante shows how the encounter between the Spartan ambassadors and Xerxes summarises the clash of cultural *nomoi* between Greek and barbarian; the Greeks cannot contemplate prostrating themselves to the king and marking his different, divine status (7.136.1), because it is against their own *nomos*.³⁸

On the other hand, *nomos* and *basileus* are related; while *nomos*, as law and custom, replaces *basileus* within Greek societies, it remains linked to kingship for cosmic kings who represent good order. Persia's Cambyses and others can find ways of equating their own desires with what is *nomos*, inverting the Pindaric tag

nomos basileus (3.38.5).³⁹ Cambyses, for example, establishes that what he wishes is the law (3.31.4–5), subverting what due process there is to get his way; for him, and other Persian rulers, *nomos* is simply determined by the *basileus*.⁴⁰

While the Spartan kings respect *nomoi*, especially the ‘Great Rhetra’ (1.65.2–66.1), which they believed had been developed by the law-giver Lycurgus and authorised by the oracle at Delphi, Greek monarchs elsewhere were not so restrained, exhibiting the full range of grotesque excesses itemised by Otanes.⁴¹ Socles the Corinthian’s great speech to the Spartans, in which he urges them not to support tyrannies in other Greek cities (5.92), narrates examples and describes support for tyranny as equivalent to turning the cosmos upside down (‘the earth . . . above the sky’, 5.92α1).

It is precisely these tyrants who are not operating within the cosmic structures of *basileia*, but simply exercising *turannis* outside any conventions or religious considerations, whom Herodotus criticises.⁴² All monarchs who exceed the proper limits of their rule transgress *nomoi*, at both local written and universal unwritten levels.

Herodotus also uses *turannos* in a technical sense to describe the single rulers of many Greek cities, notably those of Ionia and Sicily, who did not claim to be kings but held power as sole rulers.⁴³ But stories from Samos, on the boundary of Greek and non-Greek worlds, test the differences between king and tyrant, and explore the failures of tyrants as cosmic kings, with their attempts to achieve legitimation through echoing the activities of kings and establishing cosmic credentials.⁴⁴

Close reading of Herodotus’ monarchical narratives reveals a careful use of language to describe forms of rule and to categorise rulers, although the distinctions are not always as clear-cut as some have argued.⁴⁵ Neither are the distinctions quite the same as that developed by Plato, Aristotle and later theorists, in which monarchy and tyranny are opposed as the good and bad forms respectively of single-person rule within a sixfold version of the model of constitutions, as seen from a single viewpoint or criterion such as benefit to subjects.⁴⁶

Kings and knowledge

Herodotus’ kings have or aspire to a special epistemological status. They seek knowledge through inquiry, echoing the activities of the historian within the narrative.⁴⁷ Improper kings seek knowledge improperly, as Croesus the *turannos* does with his tests of the Greek oracles (1.46–54); other kings’ inquiries produce unexpected results, such as Psammetichus’ experiment (2.2), or Candaules’ loss of kingship to the bodyguard with whom he has inappropriately shared his knowledge of his wife’s beauty (1.7.8–12.2).

Many Persian texts, and those from earlier societies, make similar claims on behalf of the king. In particular, the second of Darius’ tomb inscriptions asserts the importance of the king’s intellect in adjudicating disputes, and in exercising military leadership; he credits Ahuramazda with granting him wisdom (DNb 1, 2f). Among earlier kings, Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria from 669–c. 631 BCE, made claims to knowledge, covering divination and mathematics, and to his study of texts.⁴⁸

The women of royal households appear to have a special status as knowers, often providing a contrast to the lack of knowledge demonstrated by male rulers; while knowledge underpins religious propriety and incorruptibility, a lack of knowledge, judgement and interpretative skill is repeatedly demonstrated by tyrants and weak and improper kings. From the opening story of Candaules' wife, the women of families in power demonstrate knowledge which contrasts with failures of knowledge and judgement by their husbands and fathers. The Spartan princess Gorgo, for example, comes to a clear judgement about Aristagoras and his proposal to her father that the Spartans should support the Ionian cities in their plans to revolt from Persian rule (5.51); she recognises that the wealth he promises is a source of corruption. Monarchical intellect reaches a better conclusion than the wisdom of the Athenian multitude (5.97.3).

Women who rule in their own right, such as Tomyris, queen of the Massagetae, can display exemplary analysis of political situations. Tomyris advises Cyrus to stop his attempt to bridge the river Araxes and expand into her land (1.205–6); she points out that he 'does not know that this matter will be completed to his advantage' (1.206.1).⁴⁹ It is Tomyris' counter-suggestion, that Cyrus should let her cross to his side, that elicits Croesus' warning on cyclicity (1.207.2), and an alternative plan which leads to much violence and bloodshed, including Cyrus' death.

Structure and cyclicity

While Herodotus provides stories that present monarchy at its best as a source of order within the human world, his cyclical model suggests that the stability created by even the best monarch is subject to limits and decline, and that increase can only be succeeded by decrease, unification by fragmentation.⁵⁰

In this he draws again on new models of cosmic change developed by philosophers such as Empedocles of Acragas in Sicily; Empedocles, who lived c. 495–435 BCE, is also linked with the refoundation of Thourii in southern Italy, as was Herodotus himself, and was also thought to have taught the rhetorician and politician Gorgias of Leontini.⁵¹ Empedocles' major work was a philosophical poem describing 'the nature of things', which presents a view of a cosmos alternating between states of unification and separation under the opposing forces of Love and Strife, and which survives in fragmentary form.

Herodotus attributes the idea of great circles of change to Egyptian priests (2.142.2), but his emphasis on the importance of political unity suggests resonances with Empedocles' cyclical thought.⁵² Herodotus' cyclicity is a specifically political phenomenon (1.5.3–4) that applies to 'human settlements' (ἄσπεα ἀνθρώπων), but that can be broadened to human affairs more generally, as the ex-king Croesus advises Cyrus: 'human affairs are like a wheel (ὥς κύκλος τῶν ἀνθρωπείων ἐστὶ πρηγμάτων), turning around and not allowing the same men to remain prosperous' (1.207.2). Herodotus' account of Egypt is organised in cycles (described by Immerwahr as historical periods), and they are also reported in his Greek history, with periods of peace and hostility alternating between Athens and Sparta (5.76).⁵³

Herodotus' cyclicity is articulated in terms of the increase and decrease in size and significance of different *poleis* and civilisations. Through Solon and Croesus he extends this model to the success or failure of individuals. In Empedocles' poem on nature, however, the cycle is between unity and separation of the elements of all things (31 B17 DK 1–13, 16–17):

I shall tell a double story; for at one time one thing grew to be singular (μόνον) out of many, and at another time again, many things grew from one thing (ἐξ ἑνός) to be apart.

(17.16–17)

If Herodotus were thinking of Empedocles' cycles, and mapping them onto his political elements, monarchy would represent unity.⁵⁴ Although Empedocles writes of change in number, and Herodotus of change in size, the pattern seems similar.⁵⁵ Empedocles presents a theory of four elements combining and separating in cycles, driven by the opposing forces of Love and Strife (Philotes and Neikos) (Frs. 17, 26).⁵⁶ There is some ancient testimony that Empedocles wrote about political matters (DL 8.57) and was politically active in his native Acragas; Graham suggests that his model of equal elements alternating in rule is fundamentally democratic, but while DL 8.64, 66 suggest that he might be a democrat, alternation between ruling and ruled does not necessitate a democracy, but any form of multiperson or republican rule.⁵⁷

The structure of Herodotus' historical narrative conforms to his cyclical model; good kings who create order are succeeded in time by bad ones who squander it, from the very first pairing of the Median king Deioces and his ultimate successor, his great-grandson Astyages (1.99–1.130). The decline of the Median empire is prefigured, even as it expands, by the actions of Deioces' son, who performs the act that sets the cycle moving in transgressing natural boundaries and expanding his empire (1.102); Astyages' violent actions precede his downfall and make it inevitable.

Different rulers display different qualities depending on their position in the cycle, unifying and increasing, exceeding limits or presiding over decline and collapse. Herodotus' inclusions and omissions from longer genealogies serve his depiction of the overall patterns in history.⁵⁸

Kingship in the constitution debate

The debate between Darius and his fellow conspirators exemplifies the critical assessment of rule found throughout the histories. It demonstrates both Herodotus' rich theorisation of monarchy and his critique of the practices of rule, with a focus on law and the preservation of order. Opposing claims to the maintenance of *nomos* appear in the opening and closing speeches of the debate. First, Otanes criticises tyrants for 'chang[ing] ancestral customs' (νόμαιά τε κινέει πάτρια, 3.80.5), while in response Darius claims that, for the Persians, monarchy is the established ancestral *nomos* and that since 'our ancestral laws are good we should not change them'

(πατρίους νόμους μὴ λύνειν ἔχοντας εὔ, 3.82.5). While the debate formally contrasts rule by one, few and all, the opening and closing attack and praise on monarchy stand out by virtue of their position.⁵⁹

The three sections of the constitutional debate are perhaps some of the most over-interpreted in Greek literature, but reading them as a summary of the arguments against tyranny from a sophistic/scientific perspective (Otanés' opening statement) versus those for (cosmic) kingship from a more traditional perspective (Darius' closing, victorious statement) may be instructive. As we saw earlier, Otanés' identification of the key features of tyranny in his speech against single-person rule generates a template by which other tyrants in Herodotus can be assessed. Chris Pelling's analysis of the close integration of the debate into its narrative context, of the usurpation of the Persian throne, and Darius' performance on acquiring power, is also instructive.⁶⁰ Through the surrounding narrative Herodotus broadens the debate; within it, he slips subtle differences into the portrayal of each form of government, so that there is no straightforward sixfold model of 'good' and 'bad' constitutions to compare.

In the case of monarchy, Otanés' criticism of tyranny and tyrants fits Herodotus' negative depictions of bad monarchs and tyrants. But it does not capture the positive aspects of monarchy, listed in Darius' counter-speech (3.82.1–2, 4–5). This provides a summary of Herodotus' broader exploration of traditional cosmic monarchy. While Darius' account clearly draws on Near Eastern models of cosmic kingship, it also incorporates the ideas we saw Herodotus taking from the Presocratic thinkers Heraclitus and Empedocles.⁶¹

Darius' describes an idealised form of kingship, which contrasts with his own achievements as king within the *Histories*.⁶² He opens by claiming that the best (form of governance) is the single best individual; 'nothing would seem to be better than one man, who is the best' (ἀνδρὸς γὰρ ἐνὸς τοῦ ἀρίστου οὐδὲν ἄμεινον ἂν φαεῖν, 3.82.2). This elitist claim already has a history in Greek thought, which links it to broader metaphysical claims about kingship's relationship to the unity it creates. Again, Heraclitus' political elitism is relevant, and perhaps at least the thought behind one of his sayings is echoed in Darius' assertion: 'One man is worth ten thousand, if he is the best' (εἷς [ἐμοὶ] μῦριοι, ἐὰν ἀριστος ᾖ, Fr. 49).

Darius claims that knowledge, reflection and expertise enable the monarch to make better decisions than the masses ('using his intelligence' [γνώμη . . . χρεώμενος], 3.82.2). Herodotus makes a similar point later, observing that the tyrant Aristagoras persuaded 30,000 Athenians but failed to persuade the Spartan king Cleomenes (5.97.2, cf. 6.82). Again, the idea that a single knowledgeable ruler is a better decision-maker than the masses will recur throughout fourth-century political thought, but the king as holder of wisdom within a society is a recurrent image of the writings of Persian kings.⁶³

Darius further argues that monarchy is the natural state of government, which emerges at particular points in the cycle, and that this inevitable process demonstrates its superiority (3.82.3). This conceptualisation of monarchy as the inevitable form of the unification phase of the political cycle is presented here as Darius' own, but it must represent at least some aspect of Herodotus' own analysis as

reflected in the Median and Egyptian examples of Deioces and Psammetichus, and perhaps in his treatment of Darius' own later accession, as the return to monarchy following the dynastic disruption caused by the false Smerdis. Darius' understanding of cyclicity shows a refinement of the simple model of alternation originally proposed by Herodotus (1.5.3–4). The improving part of the cycle necessitates single-person rule, and, if this corresponds to the unifying part of Empedocles' cycle, driven by Love, this would naturally take the form of the kind of kingship that Darius proposes.

The natural gravitation to monarchy may imply that monarchy is the form of government that best preserves the *patrioi nomoi* (3.82.5); Darius claims this to be the case, not as a generalisation but specifically for Persia. In the hands of the good king, *nomoi* are stabilised; in the hands of the tyrant, they are disrespected and transgressed.

Herodotus' studies of kingship

Herodotus' integration of his analysis of cosmic kingship into his model of historical cyclicity can be seen in his narratives of individual kings drawn from a range of non-Greek cultures. Herodotus carefully selects monarchs to focus on specific aspects of rule; his interest lies in the beginnings and ends of dynasties, and in major changes in fortune for both rulers and their societies, as the examples of Deioces, Psammetichus, Amasis and Darius show.⁶⁴ Herodotus positions these examples within the narrative of Cyrus' rise and the development of the Persian empire, as a commentary on it. He also applies his model to monarchies within and close to the Greek world, the kingships of Sparta and Macedon and the tyranny of Samos.

Deioces, the model king of the Medes

The story of Deioces' establishment of his kingship over the Medes (1.95–101) is the first exemplum within the series of kingship narratives, and key to understanding Herodotus' analysis of kingship.⁶⁵ It plays an important structural role, bridging the gap between the introductory Logos of Croesus (1.6–94), within which many themes of the work, including kingship and tyranny, are rehearsed, and the story of the rise of Cyrus.⁶⁶ It has, therefore, received extended attention from scholars working on Herodotus' political thought.⁶⁷ Its depiction of Deioces' rise has been read as an instance of the despotic template, but its emphasis on justice and cosmic order suggests that Deioces' accession to power represents for Herodotus a positive swing in the political cycle.⁶⁸

Deioces is presented as an exemplary founder king, who brings order and stability to a people previously deprived of it, through their own political actions and inability, to cope with their freedom from empire. The story of his Median empire is a digression within the first stage of the story of Cyrus, and establishes a pattern for other empires and their rulers. Herodotus observes that he could have told several versions of Cyrus' rise, but provides the version which 'tells it as it is' (1.95.1); his highly patterned narrative describes cyclical political structures in action.

The situation from which Deioces rises to power lies at one extreme of the political cycle. The Medes have revolted from the Assyrian empire after 520 years' subjugation (the date is around 700 BCE); their political condition is now that of good, free men who have escaped the slavery of subjugation by fighting for freedom (1.95.2). Herodotus must explain how they turned from this status, which should be on the desirable side of any series of oppositions for his Greek audience, back to single-person rule. This explanation foregrounds the protagonist's individual character and capabilities, but also provides a role for the Medes collectively in their retreat from their recently won freedom. Deioces takes advantage of the power vacuum in Media, where the population was scattered 'among small villages' (κατὰ κόμας, 1.96.2), to build a power base within one village and to expand beyond that. Deioces exhibits many characteristics of the model king/despot: 'desire for power' (ἐρασθεὶς τυραννίδος, 1.96.2), being 'wise' (σοφός, 1.96.1), 'knowledgeable' (ἐπιστάμενος, 1.96.2; γνούς, 1.97.2). He is recognised in turn as 'the only man (*anēr mounos*) capable of dispensing justice correctly' (ἄνθρωπος μόνος κατὰ τὸ ὀρθὸν δικάζων, 1.96.3), ensuring that lawlessness (*anomia*) is banished.⁶⁹

Justice is the first monarchical quality that Deioces displays, initially within his village, then among local communities, as he wins a reputation for settling disputes fairly (1.96.2).⁷⁰ Acting as a judge is the distinguishing feature of near-Eastern monarchy, and of archaic Greek kingship.⁷¹ Justice is also used to describe the relationship between cosmos and human political world.⁷² Deioces' service to the Medes is one that a Greek audience would evaluate positively. But when Deioces later withholds his expertise from the Medes, lawlessness and the unjust redistribution of goods (ἄρπαγῆς καὶ ἀνομίης, possibly a hendiadys for 'illegal seizure', 1.97.2) return to their society to an even greater extent.

Deioces' withdrawal of his services impels the Medes to collective action. They choose him (their capacity for collective action mysteriously regenerating at the prospect of good government, 1.97.2) to assume power and thereby deliver political stability. Deioces' return to rule is thus grounded in collective decision, and Herodotus gives the Medes' reasoning in direct speech; life in the present circumstances is impossible, but if they establish a king, the country will be well governed and each man can return to 'looking after his own affairs' (1.97.3, cf. 5.78).⁷³ The agency of Deioces' friends in this speech might suggest manipulation and a movement to tyranny.⁷⁴ But Herodotus needs to explain why free men would choose to submit to autocratic rule, and also to show that Deioces' kingship arises from a unification process driven by concord. By depicting Deioces as a king legitimated by collective decision, and by delivering the ideal political life of protected individual freedom, Herodotus shows the political cycle moving on and illustrates the inevitability of monarchy as a choice, as Darius will argue later.

The ambivalent status of Deioces' acts and motivations is marked, but his position in the political cycle determines their ultimate meaning. Deioces performs his good services out of his desire for power, and displays the cunning and manipulation that comes to mark the rising despot/king in Herodotus.⁷⁵ While his ability to deceive might seem to indicate tyrannical motives, the display of *mētis*, cunning intelligence, can be an ambiguous or even positive attribute in a ruler,

particularly when tied to the establishment or alteration of political order.⁷⁶ Zeus' deception of his father (*Theogony* 453–506) demonstrates *mētis*, as do many deeds of Odysseus.⁷⁷

Once Deioces has been elevated to power he explores broader forms of ordering that replicate his local acts of distributive justice on a larger scale. Firstly, he commands the Medes to build him a palace (1.98.2); both commanding and building establish his new distinct status. Graeber and Sahlins, surveying cross-cultural features of kingship, note that the royal palace is 'a model of the universe restored to a state of abstract Platonic perfection'.⁷⁸ In building his palace, Deioces creates order for his subjects. He then undertakes a version of the key political act of the founder king, synoecism, a typically Greek political act exemplified for the Athenians by their own king Theseus.⁷⁹ The Medes, who had previously lived in separate villages (1.96.2), are compelled to reorganise themselves as 'a single polis-thing', (ἐν πόλισμα, 1.98.3).⁸⁰ The unusual word *polisma* reflects a Herodotean assessment that Deioces' creation, laudable though its unification is, is not a polis in the Greek political sense of a self-governing community, nor its *politeuma* (citizenry).⁸¹

This political act of consolidation is reified by an even more substantial act of building, that of the great walls of Ecbatana (1.98.3–6). Herodotus describes the seven concentric circles of fortification, each with their individual colour scheme.⁸² This citadel establishes Deioces as a ruler capable of manifesting *thōma* (although this project is not described as such), materialises the ordering function that Deioces can now perform and mirrors Athens, with its walls having 'a circuit equivalent to that of Athens' (κατὰ τὸν Ἀθηνέων κύκλον, 1.98.4). While the size of the citadel equals that of the walled area of Athens, this similarity emphasises the much more significant differences between *polis* and *polisma*.⁸³ The ruler whose rule is opposite to democracy creates an order that opposes that of democracy.⁸⁴

Whereas Athenian speakers such as Nicias (Th. 7.77.7, cf. Themistocles' response to the wooden walls oracle, Hdt. 7.143.3) claim that the city of Athens is where its people are, emphasising as democratic politicians the priority of citizens over built fabric, Deioces excludes the populace from his city by command (1.99.1).⁸⁵ The civic participation of Athenian life is therefore impossible in the citadel of Ecbatana; it may be a model of order, but it ultimately fails as a political solution. The possibility emerges that the cosmic king can achieve order only through the preemption of political life, a political question that will recur in fourth-century discussions of kingship, when Plato and Aristotle wrestle with the difficulty of placing a supreme ruler in a city of equals, a problem identified as a 'paradox of kingship'.⁸⁶

Deioces further emphasises his different political status by the institution of court rituals and procedures designed to segregate his royal self from that of ordinary people, again reifying his superior status in terms of knowledge and managed contact with both the human and divinity. These procedures in total are a *cosmos* (κόσμον τόνδε, 1.99.1–2); Lycurgus' ordering of Sparta is also described as such (1.65.3–4). His claim to higher status may be weak, as Herodotus notes, in that other Medes may feel that they have just as strong a claim as he to the qualities on

which his claim is based (1.99.2). But by restricting the ability of his former equals to see him, he prevents them from assessing him properly. Herodotus' evaluation of this action reflects a perspective similar to questions later raised by Aristotle about kings and friendship (*Politics* 3.16.1287b25–35; see Chapter 7).

Court rituals serve a symbolic function: they maintain the distinctive status of the absolute monarch, reminding participants of their separate statuses. Correct observance of these ritual distinctions ensures the proper balance between ruler and ruled. Other kings will demonstrate weakness by failing to manage them; Darius agrees to admit his fellow-conspirators to his presence even after he becomes their king (3.84.2). Dewald highlights the separation of monarch and people as a key feature of tyranny, but it is also a feature of many traditional monarchies.⁸⁷ What distinguishes a tyrant from a king is that he claims these distinctions without the justificatory cosmological framework that underlies them in kingships.

Deioces successfully seized power, transformed himself into a king, and united six peoples (1.101), but his successors cannot match his achievement. Cyclical-ity here takes an Empedoclean form as unification is followed by fragmentation. Deioces' son Phraortes attempts to extend the empire beyond its established limits (1.102.1) but instead weakens it. There appears to be a limit to the extent of desirable unification within the metaphysics of monarchy, which Herodotus often expresses in geographical terms; expansion beyond a certain limit or point often triggers the start of the negative part of the political cycle and the failure of unified empires.⁸⁸ Further rapid cycles of change follow under Cyaxares, Deioces' grandson (1.106.1), and his successor Astyages, eventually followed by Cyrus, who will generate the next large-scale empire, that of the Persians.⁸⁹

Herodotus' short history of the Median empire does not provide a simple historical narrative, but an illustrative schema of the growth and fall of empires, written into a space temporally and geographically distant for his Greek readers. While Deioces displays some tyrannical qualities, he converts his informal power into full-scale *basileia*, selected by due process, instantiated through ritual and located within the political geography of his city.

Psammetichus and Egyptian kingship

The idea that the return to kingship is a step in the natural order of the political cycle is repeated within book 2's Egyptian history, itself structured around the transitional figure of the pharaoh Psammetichus, first of the Saitic rulers, who came to power in 664 BCE. Herodotus' Egyptian ethnography and history touch on the theme of kingship at many points, but most clearly in the story of this dynasty (2.147–82), during a time in which Greek contact and trade with Egyptians increased. Like the story of Deioces, this narrative also represents a typical pattern of kingship narrative in describing the advent to power of an outsider figure. This opening episode narrates the Egyptians' rejection of (relative) freedom and the return to rule under a single man of special status, Psammetichus (2.151–2). Psammetichus' rise to power marks the beginning of a period of stability achieved through an act of unification. Herodotus has already marked its significance by

positioning the story of Psammetichus' experiment at the start of his Egyptian excursus (2.2–3.1), in which he, the founder of a dynasty and unifier of Egypt, questions the Egyptian belief that theirs is the oldest society (2.2–3).⁹⁰ With the resumption of Psammetichus' story at its correct point in his chronology, Herodotus returns from his religious inquiries, and a temporally distant Egypt ruled by gods or men who claimed to be gods (2.144), to the narratable, relatively recent past known to Greek observers.⁹¹

Herodotus' narrative of the Saïte dynasty kings incorporates elements of history and folklore, from both Greek and Egyptian sources (2.147.1).⁹² His use of Egyptian material is not the simple exercise in 'othering' that Alan Lloyd depicts.⁹³ Ian Moyer shows how the Egyptians' physical memorialisation of the *longue durée* of history opened up ideas about the past to Herodotus, as well as how the Egyptian focus on calendars and cyclicity aligned with his interests.⁹⁴ Exposure to Egyptian knowledge educated other Herodotean characters, such as Solon, who is able to dazzle Croesus with his account of time (1.32.2–4), and was the intellectual beneficiary of cultural exchange with Egypt (2.177.2).⁹⁵ Egypt and its deliberate engagement with its past are a more than a blank on which colonialising constructions can be drawn.

In contrast with the earlier part of his Egyptian history, the linear chronological structure of the narrative of Herodotus' Saïte dynasty is regarded as reasonably accurate (Lloyd), but individual anecdotes placed within it clearly have non-historical origins and functions.⁹⁶ While there may be 'folklore' elements, in some cases the fables and myths correspond to areas of Presocratic intellectual inquiry. This is particularly the case in the story of the Saïte king Amasis (Ahmose II), which Herodotus uses to explore the problems of divine kingship. While there are Egyptian traditions of comic fables about pharaohs, it is not clear whether Herodotus draws on such a tradition, for which much of the evidence is later.⁹⁷

The thematic link between the exploration of kingship over the Medes and that over the Egyptians is emphasised by the reappearance of the same verbs for acts of freedom and assembly used to describe the political activity of the Medes in returning to kingship under Deioces: the Egyptians 'were freed' (ἐλευθερωθέντες, 2.147.2) and 'assembled together' (συνελέγοντο, 147.4). Here there is an intermediate stage of dispersed political power; but even in a state of limited political freedom under the dodecarchs, the Egyptians 'were unable to manage for long without a king (*aneu basileos*)' (οὐδένα γὰρ χρόνον οἰοί τε ἦσαν ἄνευ βασιλέος διαιτᾶσθαι, 2.147.2).

This remark, an apparent aside by Herodotus, has been seen as a dismissal of Egyptian political primitivism by a Greek asserting cultural and political superiority and marking 'otherness'; however, Lloyd regards it as 'a sound assessment' of the realities of Egyptian society, in which divine kingship played an important role.⁹⁸ H.W. Fairman, for example, described how Egyptian kings were seen as divine beings, whose rule was that of 'Horus, the legitimate heir of Osiris, whose claim to his father's throne had been vindicated in a divine court of law'.⁹⁹ Monarchic rule is identified as integral to the Egyptian way of life; certainly the demands of maintaining pharaonic cult shaped economic and social life.¹⁰⁰

Herodotus relates that the 12 kings of Egypt knew of a prophecy by which the king who poured a libation from a bronze cup would ‘rule as king (βασιλεύσειν) of all Egypt’ (2.147.4). Such unification from an initial group of 12 also features in Athenian history; it is the number of villages of Athens as Cecrops founded it, from which the polis was synoecised by Theseus.¹⁰¹ Psammetichus accidentally fulfils the prophecy when only 11 gold cups are brought to the temple for the 12 kings, and he has to use his bronze helmet as a cup (2.151); however, his route to securing his absolute kingship is more complex, requiring foreign military support to defeat his erstwhile equal co-kings.¹⁰²

Although Herodotus narrates kings’ claims to separate and superior ontological status (i.e. divinity) compared to their subjects, he also expresses their difference through attributing a distinctive epistemological status to them as enquirers after knowledge. He aligns Psammetichus with his own perspective by relating his scepticism about an oracle, which promises the help of bronze men to return him to his divinely sanctioned kingship (2.152). Just as with the subsequent account of Amasis, Herodotus depicts an Egyptian divine king responding to religion in the manner of a scientific Greek enquirer. He acknowledges the centrality of divine kingship to the Egyptian political system, but represents Egypt’s kings as themselves questioning the traditions on which this was based.¹⁰³

Herodotus’ narrative structure links political unity with its expression in the built environment, in this case the *thōma* of the Labyrinth (2.148.1–7), which Herodotus describes as built by the dodecarchs as a memorialisation of political unity, made through a shared (κοινῇ) decision (2.148.1).¹⁰⁴ Just as Deioces’ citadel, the Egyptian construction is explicitly compared to Greek efforts, temples in Ephesus and Samos (2.148.2), and Herodotus regards it as surpassing them in scale and in the wealth committed to the projects. In turn, Psammetichus commemorates his eventual ascent to kingship with a further act of building, the temple of Apis (2.153.1); this will later become the site of the act of impiety that precipitates the downfall of Cambyses (3.27–9), one of many links between Herodotus’ Egyptian and Persian narratives.¹⁰⁵

Amasis and the burdens of divine kingship

Herodotus makes further observations on the nature of kingship and the problems of the embodiment of royal power in individuals through anecdotes from the life of another Egyptian outsider king, Amasis (Ahmose II). Herodotus’ depiction of the usurper Amasis is complex and ambiguous, using apparently comic stories to explore the metaphysics of monarchy. As another cycle completes, Psammetichus’ great-grandson Apries overreaches himself with a disastrous military campaign against Cyrene; the few survivors rebel on their return to Egypt, and he sends Amasis, a popular military leader, to quell the rebellion. The rebels instead proclaim Amasis as their king (2.162.1–2), placing a helmet on his head, recalling the manner of Psammetichus’ own accession. Herodotus embeds discussions of political organisation (2.164–8) and of cult practice (2.171–2) in his story, emphasising the importance of kingship to Egypt.

Amasis is 'not at all unwilling' (οὐ κως ἀεκούσιον) to become king (2.162.2), but his humble social background and difficult personality make his transformation into the role troublesome for both king and subjects. He fulfils some functions of the good king, generating *thōma* through his additions to the temple of 'Athena'/'Neit at Sais' (2.175).¹⁰⁶ But Herodotus suggests the difficulties of Amasis' transformation from commoner to king through a series of fables that depict the pharaoh both querying and reinforcing his new status, and emphasise his subjects' desire to accept it and expectations of their king. Amasis' apparent discomfort with the change of status he had longed for thus becomes Herodotus' narrative tool for exploring the structures and possibilities of *nomos* under divine kingship; the fables transform the story of a usurper into a series of meditations on the Herodotean themes of the nature of kingship and the relativity of *nomoi*, with Presocratic and sophistic elements.

The first story examines the transformation of a piece of gold from 'golden foot-washing bowl' into the 'statue of a god' (2.172.3), and the Egyptian courtiers' changed attitude to it; whereas once they urinated and vomited in the bowl, now they pay religious honours to it (σέβεσθαι, 2.172.4). Amasis argues that, just as their opinion of the bowl was transformed by its changed shape, so the Egyptians should respect him now that he is king, transformed from 'man of the people' (δημότης) to king (*basileus*), and therefore has 'justly enslaved them' (δικαίον δουλεύειν); a startling oxymoronic inversion (2.172.5).¹⁰⁷

The story questions the fundamental tenet of divine kingship, the different ontological status of the king compared with ordinary human beings.¹⁰⁸ Amasis' recycled chamber-pot shows that the divine status of the statue is a matter of *nomos*, not *physis*; in the same way the status of the king must be conventional and not related to his physical nature, though the willingness of the Egyptians to honour the statue reveals that they are justly enslaved.¹⁰⁹ Gold is a significant material in Egyptian culture, regarded as the flesh of the gods and specifically the flesh of Horus.¹¹⁰ Leslie Kurke observes that Amasis' actions are a challenge to the 'language of metals' with which, she argues, archaic Greek culture links gold to aristocratic, kingly virtues.¹¹¹ But Amasis is querying several significations of gold and the tensions between them; it is both the repository for the highest values within a system and yet capable of changing shape and being exchanged for other things (Heraclitus Fr. 90).

The second Amasis anecdote further questions the nature of kingship, and whether it is natural to the king or an assumed role. The Egyptians apparently believed it to be the former; the king through his existence plays an important role in maintaining cosmic harmony.¹¹² Amasis, on the other hand, argued for a more nine-to-five interpretation of his responsibilities; just as a bow is strung tightly for use and loosened when not in use, he should be permitted to set aside his role and relax from time to time (2.173.3). The use of the image of a strung bow to represent the king maintaining political harmony recalls the image of cosmic harmony in Heraclitus' fragment on the tension within the bow and the lyre (Fr. 51); it also recalls the Homeric symbolism of Odysseus' great bow, which can be stretched only by the returning king himself.¹¹³

Amasis further shows himself rejecting some of the apparatus of traditional divine kingship with his tests of oracles, which reliably fail to identify him as the thief of his subjects' property (2.174). This testing offers a parallel to Croesus' testing of the Greek oracles (1.46–49), as Matthew Christ observes, but if Amasis is read as an intellectual inquirer rather than a comic character, there is more going on than Herodotus' amusement.¹¹⁴ The Philhellene pharaoh has become the agent for a Greek exploration of his own culture, a narrative pattern that Herodotus repeats in his account of Darius, investigating *nomos* (3.38) and Scylas the Scythian, who seeks the knowledge of mystery rites (4.78–80).

Amasis' development of love for the Greeks or Greek culture as a 'Philhellene' (2.178.1) is an unusual characteristic; this perhaps reflects the increased level of controlled trade between the two cultures, but in Amasis' case seems to reflect a cultural interchange and the knowledge of Greek ideas which Herodotus' characterisation imputes to him.¹¹⁵ Herodotus has already placed him as the Egyptian whom Solon met on his travels (1.30.1), and from whom Solon borrowed a law for Athens (2.177.2).¹¹⁶ 'Greek' and 'other' become interchangeable in the story of Amasis; the transmitter of knowledge to the Greeks is himself represented as a lover of Greek things, and this is most evident in the philosophical undercurrents to his narrative.

Amasis' concern with *nomos* is replayed in a grotesque anecdote about the mistreatment of his body after his death, when Cambyses ordered that his corpse be removed from his tomb, whipped and assaulted, and when due to mummification it remains intact, burned (3.16.2). This opens a discussion on different religious practices in the treatment of the dead and the preservation versus destruction of bodies – Cambyses' acts have offended both Egyptian and Persian customs (3.16.4), although part of what caused offence was the practice of cremation, entirely acceptable within Greek cultures. The nature of fire is different across the cultures, which again brings Heraclitus, in whose natural philosophy fire plays a key role, to mind.¹¹⁷

Herodotus returns to Cambyses' expression of his insanity through his disregard for religious custom at 3.38. While Cambyses' outrages against the bull god Apis spark the discussion, Herodotus returns to different customs for disposing of the dead as the prime example of cultural difference. Cambyses' insane indifference to the transgression of *nomoi* (3.38.1–2) is contrasted to Darius' external perspective and ability to see differences between the cultures at the edges of his world, among Greeks and Indians (3.38.3–4). The handling of corpses may have been a standard topos in the discussion of differing cultures and their *nomoi*; Heraclitus states that corpses should be thrown out quicker than dung (Fr. 96), possibly a gibe at Orphic burial customs.¹¹⁸ But here, what Darius explores and confirms is a Greek observation.

Kingship at the limits of the Greek world

If the cosmic content of Herodotus' model of kingship is important for Persian and Egyptian kings, how does Herodotus apply it to Greek monarchs, both kings and tyrants? How far can cosmic models of kingship be incorporated into the polis,

which arguably exists to create unity and strength within the collective body of equal citizens? Herodotus refines his metaphysics of monarchy in applying it to the Greek kings of both *poleis* (Sparta) and *ethnos* states (Macedon), and it can also be seen to operate in his accounts of tyranny within the polis (Samos). Herodotus has established a model of kingship that, in drawing on ideas of the cosmic king and his special status, renders it alien to the Greek political structures of the polis. In turn, these are deprived of an established source of political unity, that delivered by the unifying king. This creates a problem in accounting for Greek kings, as he must do with the case of Macedonia and Sparta, which spills into the analysis of tyrants engaged with kingly activities, as with the story of the Samian tyrants.

Herodotus' kingship narratives also reach into mythical space and time, in the foundation stories of the Macedonian (8.137–8) and Scythian (4.5) dynasties, both of which narrate the stories of three brothers, of whom the youngest successfully interacts with a mysterious omen (Colaxais at 4.5.4, Perdiccas at 8.137.3–5). These stories are set in a past regarded as distant by the communities from which they originate (although markedly less distant than some foundation stories). The story of Perdiccas legitimates both the rule of Macedonian kings, and their claim to Greek identity through Argive descent.¹¹⁹ Three brothers arrive in the town of Lebadea and begin to work for the king, tending his herds. The king's wife bakes bread, but each loaf she intends for the youngest brother Perdiccas doubles in size. Her husband realises the significance of the omen and sends the boys away, refusing them any wages but a shaft of sunlight entering his house through the hole in the roof through which smoke escaped. Perdiccas cuts the sunbeam and takes it as his wages, and the brothers escape across the river to Macedon where they eventually found their kingdom. The 'fairy-tale' elements of the story further connect kingship, divine sanction and cosmic order, as Perdiccas demonstrates his ability to manipulate the environment in a manner not available to ordinary humans.¹²⁰

Herodotus seems troubled by the hereditary principle in Spartan kingship. He provides king lists for both royal houses, the Agiads (7.204) and Eurypontids (8.131.2), but problematises this heredity through multiple investigations of Spartan royal marriages and succession disputes.¹²¹ Succession is always problematic for Herodotean kings; the identity of legitimate inheritors may be compromised, oracles discarded or misinterpreted. Such difficulties become a point of comparison between Persia and Sparta when the deposed Damaratus advises Xerxes on his succession (7.3). Disputed successions enable a strong claimant to demonstrate his true worth, or the divine to reveal the correct claimant; Herodotus often presents successors who have not had to fight for their throne as weak, divisive kings who represent a downturn in the political cycle.

In the Macedonian case, the story provides a framework for the legitimisation of the rule of Macedonian kings over their subjects, and their claim to Greek identity through their Argive descent.¹²² But the 'fairy-tale' elements of the story, which Hammond likens to that of Alfred burning the cakes, are significant for their connection of kingship, divine sanction and cosmic order, in a monarchy that was later to serve as a (contentiously) positive example for fourth-century theorists.¹²³

The island of Samos, with its in-between position halfway between West and East, provides the location for examining the distinction between kingship and tyranny.¹²⁴ The stories of Amasis and Polycrates, and of Maeandrius, serve to highlight the distinctions between kings and tyrants.

Firstly, the lack of cosmic capability of the tyrant compared to the king drives Herodotus' account of the tyrant Polycrates and the Egyptian pharaoh Amasis' interpretation of his apparent good fortune in the loss and recovery of his ring (3.40–3). This story has many messages on human fortune and divine retribution for a Greek reader, but for the purposes of distinguishing kings and tyrants it is notable that it is the (relatively) traditional divine king, Amasis, who demonstrates the capacity to access the response of the gods to Polycrates' good fortune. While Amasis appeared to reject divination and religion in his own story (2.174.2), here he 'reads the omens' correctly (προεμαντεύσατο, 3.125.4), and correctly assesses the potential divine reaction to events in the human world.¹²⁵ His knowledgeable status is emphasised in his first letter (ἐπισταμένω, 3.40.2; οἶδα, 3.40.3). He understands the mechanisms that drive cyclicity in the cosmos, whereas Polycrates the tyrant has no access to this knowledge, and cannot therefore anticipate cyclical change.¹²⁶

Secondly, Maeandrius, Polycrates' secretary (*grammatistēs*), succeeds to his tyranny and attempts to bring *isonomia* to Samos (3.142–49).¹²⁷ However, although he wishes to leave the Samians to govern themselves (3.142.3), he realises that if he steps down, someone else will seize power, frustrating his intentions, and that the only possible action open to him is to maintain a grip on power through rounding up opponents. The Samians themselves 'did not want to be free' (ἐλεύθεροι, 3.143.2).¹²⁸ Although Maeandrius' offer to step down is made irrelevant by his illness, the ensuing power-struggle and the arrival of the Persians (3.144), it echoes the structure of larger-scale kingship narratives in which the decision to return to centralised single-person rule is a collective one.

The aspect of his tyranny that Maeandrius had wanted to keep was his priesthood of Zeus Eleutherios, linked to the sanctuary he established on accession to the tyranny (3.142.2).¹²⁹ The commemoration of the rise to power through the building of religious structures is a feature of Herodotean kingship, exemplified by many pharaohs and Near Eastern kings, and a feature of kingship echoed by tyrants.¹³⁰ Maeandrius' desire to keep his priesthood shows that he believes it to be separable from the *turannis*, and that this accretion of religious status to the Samian tyranny is not essential to it.

Nonetheless, Herodotus depicts this thoughtful man, a *grammatistes*-tyrant if not a philosopher king, as emphasising the religious aspects that he has added to his role. Herodotus shows that at least some tyrants acknowledged the importance of cosmic imagery and claims for the legitimisation of kingship.

Conclusion

For Herodotus, good kingship is possible within quite specific limits, which require the political cycle to be at the point where unification and a fresh start are needed. Beyond these limited cases, there is a strong risk that the individual

monarch will cross the line into tyranny and reinaugurate the other cycle of decline and separation. Herodotus' exploration of monarchy draws on traditional Near Eastern accounts of monarchy as the instantiation of cosmic order, a tradition that jarred with the ideology of the democratic polis but which that ideology largely failed to replace.

Herodotus' account of monarchy provides a unique account of the intersection of different cultural traditions, and provides important context and exemplary material for fourth-century Greek political thought. His models both of cosmic monarchy and Greek tyranny shaped the further exploration of monarchy by Plato and Aristotle, both of whom draw on his examples and themes – for Plato, the antiquity of Egyptian *nomoi*, the importance of limit; for Aristotle, the model of cosmic and metaphysical argument about monarchy as one over many, to contrast to the models of virtue monarchy developed by Isocrates (*Nicocles*, *Helen*) and Xenophon (*Cyropaedia*).¹³¹ Xenophon's Cyrus responds clearly and directly to Herodotus' account of Persian kingship.

Notes

- 1 Paul Cartledge, drawing on Lasserre 1976, cf. Stroheker: 382–92, suggests that Herodotus makes 'an incredible ask' in expecting readers to treat this debate as historical (Cartledge 2009: 73). Chris Pelling shows how the debate is firmly embedded in Herodotus' historical narrative and should not be seen as extraneous to it (Pelling 2002a).
- 2 Dewald 2003; Luraghi 2015.
- 3 Translations and commentaries of these texts can be found in Kuhrt 2007a; the Bisitun inscription (*DB*) at pp. 141–58, the two tomb inscriptions (*DNa* and *DNb*) at pp. 502–5; Kuhrt identifies the latter pair as a 'mirror of princes'. See Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1993 for analysis of their political-theoretical content.
- 4 On Persian monarchical ideology and practice in its Near Eastern context, see Barjamovic 2012.
- 5 Strathern 2019: 156–69. On Herodotus as historian of the cultural oppositions the Axial Age model seeks to dismantle, see Jaspers 1953: 67–9.
- 6 See Sahlins 2017a for an account of the origins of kingship in the imitation of cosmic structures of governance.
- 7 Gigante 1956: 123–45; Giraudeau 1984: 115–36.
- 8 On political myth as a distinct form of expression: Bottici 2007: 177–86; Flood 1996: 41–5; Tudor 1972: 16–17. On the mythical elements ('mythemes', after Lévi-Strauss 1963: 206–31) of Herodotean narratives: Sourvinou-Inwood 1991: 244–67.
- 9 Cartledge 2002b: 75–7; Davie 1979; Flory 1987: 119–22; Munson 2001; Thompson 1996.
- 10 Immerwahr 1966: 76–8; Ward 2008.
- 11 Dewald admits some ambiguity (2003: 27–32, 47–9, cf. Gammie 1986).
- 12 Lateiner 1989: 181–6.
- 13 Munson 2001: 136.
- 14 Harrison 2003: 149.
- 15 Gammie 1986: 171–2.
- 16 Clarke 2018: 171–95.
- 17 Luraghi 2013a, 2015: 78.
- 18 Sixfold models: Pl. *Plt.* 291d–292b, Arist. *Pol.* 3.7.1279a22–b11. Edouard Will argues for an early development of this model (Will 1972: 506–9) while Peter Rhodes points

- to its fourth-century context (Rhodes 2010: 74–5). Cf. Hobbes’ insistence on a three-fold rather than sixfold model, *Leviathan* Ch. 19, on the grounds that the further forms are ‘the same Formes misliked’ (Hobbes 1996: 130).
- 19 In turn the negative exemplar of the despotic template presents a warning to Athens that its exceptional status does not mean that it will escape from the cycle (cf. Moles 1996).
 - 20 The extent to which Achaemenid kings claimed or were perceived to have divinity or an association with the divine is contested, but their iconography contains many religious elements (Allan 2005; L’Orange 1953; Root 1979, 2013), and Greeks tended to assume that *proskynesis* implied acknowledgement of divinity (cf. Hdt. 7.136.1–2, and Bowden 2013).
 - 21 Again, the assessment of Athens at 5.78, where the advent of *isēgoria* and collective freedom from tyranny enables each individual Athenian to take care of his own business (cf. Gigante 1956: 127–8), suggests that this can be accomplished outside the monarchical model. Cf. Plato’s idea of justice within the city as characterised by citizens carrying out their own proper functions (*Rep.* 4.433a1–b5), linking this to the principle of specialisation.
 - 22 Pelling 2016: 71, cf. Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1983 and, on the nineteenth-century construction of the Herodotean project, Rood forthcoming.
 - 23 L.G. Mitchell 2013: 23–4.
 - 24 Ferrill 1978; Parker 1998. *Turannos* may be a loan-word from Lydia, to describe local political arrangements, whereas *monarchos* suggests the development of analysis of types of rule by number of rulers, the basis of much early Greek political analysis (Labarbe 1971).
 - 25 Ferrill 1978: 388, citing the fisherman addressing Periander (3.42.2), Periander his son (3.52.4), Athenian envoys Gelo of Syracuse (7.161.1) and the Delphic oracle issued to Cypselus (5.92ε2). This may be a difficult case, depending on the assessment of the authorship of verse oracles cited by Herodotus.
 - 26 Ferrill 1978: 389. Ferrill does not use the language of narratology, but is clearly talking about focalisation.
 - 27 Dewald 2003: 32–3. Kingship words: βασιλεύς (1.7.2), βασιλεύσαντες (1.7.3); τύραννος (1.7.2).
 - 28 That tyranny has an erotic attraction for leaders is also thematic, cf. 1.96.2 where Deioces is ‘besotted with tyranny’ (ἐρασθεὶς τυραννίδος).
 - 29 In this sense the Spartan dyarchy is distinct from other dual-kingship systems identified by anthropologists and historians, who see a different division of labour between the two kings, with one representing a cosmic system and the other a heroic (Strathern 2019: 187–9).
 - 30 See Oakley 2006: 13, and Hocart 1970: 168.
 - 31 See Hocart 1970: 162–79. Marshall Sahlins observes that some dual-kingship systems mark the balance between different elements or sub-groups within a society, or the incorporation of an outsider king (Sahlins 2017b: 243–5).
 - 32 Seaford 2003a: 98–9.
 - 33 Carlier 1984: 440–3; C. Osborne 1997: 110–13.
 - 34 Emlyn-Jones 1980; Horky 2009: 51–61.
 - 35 G.E.R. Lloyd 1966: 222–3; C. Osborne 1997. Lloyd argues against monarchism among the Presocratics, regarding it as incompatible with the scientific exploration of *phusis*.
 - 36 Kurke 1999b: 257–60, cf. Plato *Plt.* 292ε6–9.
 - 37 C. Osborne 1997: 95–7.
 - 38 This anecdote further problematises a ‘Greeks versus others’ conception of Herodotus’ worldview; Xerxes observes that it is Sparta not Persia that has transgressed the universal custom of respecting heralds (7.136.2); see Gigante 1956: 124–5.
 - 39 Pindar Fr. 169.1, Gigante 1956: 109–12. Kingsley 2018 analyses the relationship between *nomos* and monarchy in Herodotus’ use of this fragment, which she connects

to ideas of monarchical violence; see Chapter 4 for Plato's use of the fragment in the *Gorgias*.

- 40 Cartledge 2002b: 74–5; Pelling 2002a: 139–40 show the close link between Otanes' speech and the stories about Cambyses.
- 41 See Lateiner 1989; Dewald 2003; Pelling 2002a: 126 on the relation of tyranny stories to the constitution debate.
- 42 Gray 1996; Johnson 2001.
- 43 Tyranny as a regional phenomenon: Ionia (4.98.2), Sicily (7.153–6).
- 44 Pelling 2007: 188; Clarke 2018: 174–5.
- 45 Speakers within Herodotus may make different assessments, in addressing their tyrant as *basileus*. Otanes may be a proxy for Herodotus' own views, but the anti-democracy views of 5.97 might counter the link as much as the pro-democracy views of 5.78 advance it.
- 46 See n.18 above.
- 47 Christ 1994: 168–71. Provencal 2015 argues that Herodotus presents the kings as sophists.
- 48 Ashurbanipal Assyrian Tablet 002.i.13–18; see Novotny and Jeffers 2018; Taylor 2018: 94, also online at <http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/rinap/rinap5/pager>.
- 49 Payen 1991: 261–61.
- 50 While in Darius' model, political change always attempts to return to monarchy (3.82.2–3).
- 51 Diogenes Laertius 8.51–69, *KRS* 280–2.
- 52 Both Empedocles and Herodotus will influence Plato's cyclical model in his *Statesman* myth; see Chapter 6.
- 53 Immerwahr 1966: 150–1; Moles 1996: 276–7.
- 54 Both authors share an interest in mystery religion and cycles of incarnation: Hdt. 2.123 on Egyptian and Dionysiac views on reincarnation, for example; Empedocles Frs. 8, 9, and 115 on the causes of the cycle, *KRS* 291–2, 314–5.
- 55 Immerwahr 1966: 150–2 notes the influence of both Heraclitean flux and Empedoclean cyclicity, arguing that Herodotus' historical model owes more to Heraclitus.
- 56 Fr. 17, particularly lines 1–12, 27–9. Graham 2005: 236–7; Sedley 2005: 347–53.
- 57 Graham 2010: 425 n.F20.26–35; while Vlastos 1947: 149–50 argues that the *isonomia* of elements necessitates democracy, G.E.R. Lloyd 1966: 223 argues that the rotation of rule suggests oligarchy or aristocracy.
- 58 Immerwahr 1966: 26–8.
- 59 Otanes' praise of *isonomia* (3.80.5–6) is also important, but not as structurally significant within book 3 as for later books; features of democracy, such as *isegoria*, are picked up later, e.g. 5.78, 6.43.
- 60 Dewald 2003: 28–30; Lateiner 1989: 167–70; see also Flory 1987; Thompson 1996. Pelling 2002a: 149–52 uses this analysis to oppose the view that the debate originates in a sophistic source (as suggested by Lasserre 1976; Stroheker 1954).
- 61 Gammie 1986: 178–85, 95 is an exception. *Philia* can also, as Darius notes, become a negative in oligarchy where it causes factionalism, but this *stasis* leads to monarchy (3.82.3).
- 62 This may be the idealised Darius of Aeschylean tragedy (Alexanderson 1967; Lasserre 1976: 72–3); see Chapter 2.
- 63 See n.3 above.
- 64 Asheri 2007b: 145–7; Brown 1988; Helm 1981; Sancisi-Weerdenburg 1988: 210–12. Helm and Sancisi-Weerdenburg challenge the historicity of Herodotus' Median logos, while Brown acknowledges the possibility of its transmission through oral sources. There are similar names in cuneiform sources (Daiukku = Deioces), but in a revolt narrative of which the chronology does not match Herodotus' account (Asheri 2007a: 467–8; Brown 1988: 75–6; Wiesehöfer 2004; *DB* 68, cf. Ctesias *FGH* 688 F13.16).
- 65 Flory 1987: 122–8.

- 66 Pelling 2006; Thomas 2012: 244–52.
- 67 Meier et al. 2004; Raaflaub 2002; Waters 1972: 144–5.
- 68 Dewald 2003: 27–8; Ward 2008: 116–19. Gray 1996: 364–6 and Thomas 2012 note that Deioces' story places greater emphasis on justice than those of Greek tyrants do.
- 69 For Thomas 2012: 250–1, the abstract noun *anomiē* suggests a sophistic context for the story.
- 70 Asheri 2007b: 149; Coulet 1992: 376–9; Lateiner 1989: 276 n.32. Deioces is the opposite of Hesiod's gift-eating kings (Hes. *Op.* 261–5).
- 71 See Introduction: the Hebrew *Book of Kings* and *Book of Judges* provide further comparative examples: Bolin 1999.
- 72 Kouloumentas 2009: 168–90; G.E.R. Lloyd 1966: 210–32, Anaximander DK 12 B 1.
- 73 Cf. Pl. *Rep.* 4.433ae. Xenophon *Mem.* 3.2.1–2 pursues the idea of the selection of the king being in the best interests of the collective, in a military context.
- 74 Lateiner 1989: 171.
- 75 Cf. 2.121: the young man who outwits the wealthy pharaoh Rhampsinitus and wins his daughter further exemplifies the relationship between *mētis* and outsiders' accession to power.
- 76 Lateiner 1989: 171–2.
- 77 Detienne and Vernant 1974: 61–103: *polumētis* Odysseus, the *ou tis/mē tis* of *Od.* 9. The mytheme of the successor's mother (e.g. Gaia and Rhea in the *Theogony*) emerges in Herodotus' succession narratives, particularly the Spartan ones (5.39–41, 6.62–6).
- 78 Sahlins and Graeber 2017: 11.
- 79 Cf. Thucydides 1.10.2 of the Spartans compared with other Greeks, 2.15 of Athens under Theseus; Isoc. *Helen* 35.
- 80 How and Wells 1989 *ad loc.*
- 81 Other uses of *polisma* by Herodotus; 1.57 (Pelasgian settlements in Attica, which are thus pre-*polis*); 1.143 (only Athens counts as an Ionian *polisma logimon*, 143.2, but the 12 Ionian cities are *polies*, 143.3); 1.178.1–2 (Babylon); 6.6 (Ionian cities); in some cases *polisma* implies a fortified settlement, like Babylon 'structured and adorned like no other *polisma* of which we know'. Aeschylus uses the plural *polismata* to describe Asian settlements (*Pers.* 249, cf. 119; see Ch. 2).
- 82 Asheri notes that this is an 'imaginary citadel': Asheri 2007b: 150. Bichler 1995, 2000: 236 n.87 argues for a Utopian character to the project. The colours Herodotus describes are the divine colours of the planets in Chaldaean mythology, and also resemble Plato's round earth (*Ph.* 110b–111e). L'Orange cites Herodotus' Ecbatana as a model 'cosmic city' (L'Orange 1953: 9–17).
- 83 Pradeau 1997: 157 notes similarities between Herodotus' Ecbatana and Plato's anti-Athens, Atlantis (*Critt.* 115c4–117d5), while L'Orange compares it to the *Laws*' Magnesia (L'Orange 1953: 9).
- 84 Asheri 2007b: 149–50; Flory 1987: 126.
- 85 Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 3.3.1276a22–30, where the nature of a polis of movable citizens is contrasted to the walls of Babylon and the Peloponnese.
- 86 See Chapters 6 and 7, and Riesbeck 2016: 17–30.
- 87 Dewald 2003: 27–8. The hierarchical organisation of space and exclusion in palace complexes (including contemporary ones, such as the Imperial Palace in Tokyo, and Buckingham Palace in London) suggests that controlling space and access is a cross-cultural and cross-temporal feature of monarchy, suitable for structuralist analysis. See Ohnuki-Tierney 2005: 219–21 on the invention of tradition in Meiji-era Japanese monarchy.
- 88 The idea that a unified political entity has a correct maximum size of territory and population is further explored in Aristotle's *Politics* (7.4.1326a25–b7).
- 89 Pelling 1996.

- 90 Spalinger 1976; Sulek 1989. Psammetichus may intend to confirm rather than challenge the accepted view.
- 91 Vannicelli 2001: 235–6. Herodotus may here be adopting the Egyptians' own perspectives on this, or the traditions of Greek traders.
- 92 Fowler 1996: 85.
- 93 A.B. Lloyd 2010: 1074–6.
- 94 Moyer 2011: 68–74.
- 95 Croesus, who explains cyclicity to Cyrus (1.207.2), has learned Solon's lesson well.
- 96 A.B. Lloyd 1975–1988: I.185–94, 1988: 38–9, 2007: 238–9. Vannicelli (2001: 224–30) suggests that the problems arise from Herodotus' attempt to synchronise Egyptian history with Greek mythical prehistory (in which he may be following Hecataeus).
- 97 Although there are Egyptian stories in the *Königsnovelle* tradition about Ahmose and his adventures, they date from Ptolemaic Egypt, centuries later, perhaps providing evidence of a 'folklore' tradition: A.B. Lloyd 1975–1988: I.103–4, III.213–4; Loprieno 1996.
- 98 A.B. Lloyd 2007: 347.
- 99 Cartledge 2002b: 38; Lateiner 1989: 171; on Egyptian divine kingship see Fairman 1958: 85 (on the king's role in agriculture); Frankfort 1948: 51–60; Heusch 1987: 249–55; Janssen 1978: 218–23; Kemp 1983: 71–6. De Heusch points to the centrality of maintenance of (cosmic) order in the pharaoh's role. Graeber argues that the Egyptian pharaoh is one of the few true examples of divine kingship (Graeber 2017a: 72).
- 100 Graeber 2017b: 424–8.
- 101 For Fehling (1989: 216–39) this is an example of Herodotus' dubious use of 'typical numbers', but it seems more likely that Herodotus is emphasising the parallel with Athens (Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F2, F94, plus *Marmor Parium* 20). Other groups of 12 include the cities of Ionia, Hdt 1.143, 145. The world itself is shaped as a dodecahedron in Pl. *Phd.* 110b5–c1, the whole cosmos, *Ti.* 55c4–6.
- 102 Kurke (1999a: 91) observes that Herodotus signals a reversal by the use of metals for uncharacteristic purposes; a king should be crowned with gold.
- 103 The impact of this depends on whether inquiry is seen as a characteristically Greek activity or a characteristically kingly activity.
- 104 On *thōma* in Egypt: A.B. Lloyd 1975–1988: I.141–7, and Munson (2001: 241), noting that 'numerous large buildings . . . are recruited in the service of the monarchical code, and . . . designated with words of the *thōma* family'.
- 105 Dillery 2005; Gammie 1986: 180–2, the latter noting tensions between Herodotus' account and other Egyptian traditions.
- 106 This temple is notable as the location for interactions between Greek and Egyptian wisdom, in both Plato (*Ti.* 20–26) and Herodotus (2.28).
- 107 Harrison 2003: 149–50; Vasunia 2001: 80.
- 108 Aristotle uses this story (*Politics* 1.12.1259b6–9) to illustrate the royal desire to establish difference in honours and respect paid.
- 109 The value ascribed to gold also appears in Heraclitus Fr. 9 (Aristotle *EN* X.5 1176a6), cf. Seaford 2004: 237–42. The story may also be read in terms of Aristotelian causes; the formal cause of the statue is different from that of the chamber-pot.
- 110 Frankfort 1948: 46, 135 citing Breasted 1906: II.145.
- 111 Kurke 1999a: 92–4.
- 112 Frankfort 1948: 36–47 (the king's role); 9–12 (cosmic order).
- 113 *Od.* 21.10–12. Textual problems in Heraclitus' fragments – *palintonos* v. *palintropos* – make it hard to confirm Herodotus' allusion to Heraclitus (Kahn 1981: 198–9).
- 114 Christ 1994: 191.
- 115 Török 1992.
- 116 cf. Solon's Egyptian learning in Plato *Timaeus* 20–26. The legal borrowing cannot be a historical event as Solon left Athens before Amasis became pharaoh (A.B. Lloyd 1975–1988: I.55–7).

- 117 Heraclitus Frs. 30, 90 on fire as an *archē* and means of delivery of the cosmic process of reorder and retribution.
- 118 Kahn 1981: 327 n.286.
- 119 Asheri 2003: 347–50; Hatzopoulos 2003: 215–18 attempts to locate the brothers' origins.
- 120 Hammond 1979: 6–7; Kleinknecht 1966.
- 121 Anaxandridas (5.39–41); the consequences of the original twinship (6.51); Cleomenes, Ariston/Demaratus and Leotychidas (6.61–72). See Immerwahr 1966: 197–8.
- 122 Asheri 2003: 347–50; Hatzopoulos 2003: 215–18 attempts to locate the brothers' origins.
- 123 Hammond 1979: 6–7; Kleinknecht 1966.
- 124 Pelling 2007: 188. Herodotus attributes his focus on Samos to the presence there of three feats of human endeavour, the water engineering works, the harbour and the temple (3.60).
- 125 Polycrates' daughter also foresees his downfall and death in a dream, an interesting example of the capabilities of Herodotus' royal women (3.124.1–2, 3.125.4).
- 126 Clarke 2018. This story may explain Polycrates' alleged Medism in breaking his alliance with Egypt, drawn from Samian sources (e.g. Lateiner 1989: 183; B.M. Mitchell 1975: 84–5).
- 127 Described in kingly terms by Maeandrius as 'sceptre and power' (σκήπτρον καὶ δύναμις, 3.142.3). Maeandrius the *grammatistēs* might seem an unlikely successor tyrant, but Steiner's linkages of tyranny to writing and the possession of secrets may suggest that he is highly suited to the role (Steiner 1994)
- 128 Maeandrius' speech echoes that of Otanes closely (*es meson* ('in public'), 3.80.2, 142.3; *isonomia*, 3.80.6, 143.3): Pelling 2002a: 152–3 observes the irony that it is the Otanes of the constitutional debate who ends Maeandrius' rule, and also that the Samos story replays the themes of book III in a Greek context.
- 129 Cf. 9.116.
- 130 Katherine Clarke (2018) treats royal construction projects as an inherent part of the despotic template. Royal construction projects: Ecbatana (1.100); Egyptian pyramids (2.124–5) and labyrinth (2.148–9); the walls of Babylon (1.180–1); water engineering works at Babylon (1.185–6) and Egypt (2.149–50), the canal at Mount Athos and bridge over the Strymon (7.22–6).
- 131 Pradeau 1997: 157–77 examines the Herodotean language of Plato's political model of Atlantis; cf. Desclos 2003 on Plato and historiography.

2 Monarchy on the democratic stage

The depiction of monarchy in Athenian drama reflected and reshaped the complex and contradictory development of the categorisation of constitutions within the context of Athenian democracy. Heroic myth provided a framework in which to investigate leadership and to explore the relationship of the polis and its citizens with the cosmos, how to order and unify the polis within this larger-scale whole and the characteristics of citizens and leaders in performing this task. Such concerns are evident in the communities depicted in tragedy and comedy, some historical, and others fantastic.

Dramatists' interest in the bad form of single-person rule, tyranny, may seem more easily accounted for in the city which mythologised its own tyrannicides (Thuc. 1.20.3, 6.53.3–59.4); the audience at the City Dionysia could recognise the depiction of tyranny in characters such as Creon (Sophocles' *Antigone*), and compare powerful characters vying for power; some plays juxtapose good and bad, or better and worse rulers, or show one ruler slipping between these categories. Aeschylus' *Persians* provides a complex depiction of different types of rule; two kings, ideal and weak, and two polities, despotic and democratic, an early demonstration of the complexity of the analysis of politics in tragedy. Aristophanes' everyman characters probe the status of the citizen and claim affinity with Zeus. Ordinary citizens, powerful generals, and the wealthy individuals who financed festival productions might all have taken messages from the plays they saw.¹

Fifth-century Attic tragedy links good kingship to Athenian political values, through the positive portrayal of Athenian kings, and kings with Athenian connections. The Athenian king-heroes Theseus (most notably in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* and Euripides' *Suppliants*) and Erechtheus (Euripides' *Erechtheus*) represent positive Athenian values on stage. The representation of good kings spans the entire period of fifth-century classical Athenian tragedy, but becomes more closely associated with Athenian political myth as the century progresses; the good king becomes the ideal Athenian.²

This figure has troubled tragedy's interpreters. Some have queried this 'anachronism' ('brehtaking', according to Hall, 'exquisite' to Parker); others interpreted his presence as the historicising retrojection of democratic political leaders such as Pericles into the timeless mythical environment of tragedy, set in the heroic, prehistoric past.³ The 'democratic king' might embody the collective citizenry, and

also link city to gods and cosmos; Theseus was a significant figure in Athenian cult.⁴ His presence on the tragic stage permits the historical city to interact with the continuous present of myth, during the suspension of normal life created by festivals.⁵ The personification of virtue and citizenship in the democratic king enables democratic Athens to avoid the phenomenon of the democratic void, identified by Lefort.⁶

The Athenian political imaginary and drama

The democratic king may exemplify the ideal democratic citizen, Vidal-Naquet's *roi-citoyen* and the collective citizenry, but his presence suggests that democracy depends upon a non-democratic cultural, religious and political framework, which generates the unity of the city.⁷

Athenian tragedies were staged within a political environment, presented in competition as part of the Athenian polis-funded and organised festival of the Dionysia.⁸ The scope and number of dramatic festivals made them a prime vehicle for the display of Athenian ideology to a mass audience, both of Athenians and (during the City Dionysia) of other Greeks.⁹ Tragic dramatists expressed analysis of the city, leadership and contemporary thought through manipulation and development of traditional mythical settings and plots, exploring and testing the shared social and political imaginary.¹⁰ Dramatists could explore Athenian values that related to the individual citizen, such as equality and intelligence, and to the polis as a whole, such as its status in relation to the other Greek cities or to non-Greek cultures. By embedding these explorations within new versions of established mythical narratives, the dramatists were able to contest for dominance of this imaginary, or at least depict the contest for dominance. The reception of tragedy set limits on this process of reinvention, but the varied body of plays concerned with Athenian kingship suggests that dramatists found the stories of kings useful, and capacious enough to adapt and retell.¹¹ The content of the myths retold in tragedy was subject to continuing reinvention; tragedies refined stories and emphasised the role of Athenian heroes, such as Theseus or Erechtheus, and elements significant to Athenians, such as autochthony, while comedy parodied them.¹²

Euripides' *Heracles* demonstrates how the retelling of multiple myths valorises Athens and its self-image.¹³ Euripides resequences the myth of Heracles' labours so that Theseus can encounter him after the completion of his labours and the slaughter of his children. Theseus, appearing almost as a *deus ex machina* ('I have come' ἦκω, 1163), is both an Athenian military commander (1163–5) and the hero whom Heracles rescued from the underworld (1221–2). His personal obligation to reciprocate Heracles' aid (1169–71, 1335–6) motivates his visit to Thebes, but the result of bringing Heracles to Athens for purification and eventual cult will be greater glory for the collective citizens (1334–5).¹⁴

The acute focus on different types of constitution and qualities of leadership in the suppliant plays shows that the figure of the monarch provided a means for assessing democracy.¹⁵ The tragic focus on the exceptional individual underscores the metaphysical function of the imaginary king as the source of continuing civic unity.

The good king in the polis

The question of whether a ruler will turn out to be a tyrant or a good king, or fall ambivalently between the extremes, drives tragic plots. Kings exercise their role in three major functions: the religious, as a priest; the military, as a general; and the political, as leader of councils and judge in tribunals.¹⁶ Aeschylus' Agamemnon, for example, has triumphed in the military aspect, but at the expense of the political in his neglect of potential rivals at home, and with questions raised over the religious aspects, notably in the sacrifice of his daughter Iphigenia in the aristocratic interest of his family rather than the collective interest of his city.¹⁷ These weaknesses suggest that he fails to qualify as a good king. Sophocles' Oedipus also aims to be a good king, exercising his knowledge on behalf of his people, yet unaware of the fate that makes this impossible.¹⁸

Some kings are depicted more positively. They are often secondary characters, appearing as the founder/synoecist of a city (usually Athens) in its political form (Theseus), or as originary culture heroes (Pelagus), and offering help to the play's protagonists, as Aegeus does Medea. They refrain from exercising political authority, preferring to accept the decisions of the people, but will exercise military authority to back up those decisions with force. Most notably they exercise religious authority, mediating between polis and cosmos, using their intelligence and skills to solve religious problems, and determining when special religious measures are required to preserve relations with the gods or to save the city. Some forms of action, such as the decision to accept or reject suppliants, or how to appease the gods in a moment of crisis for the polis, crystallise multiple political problems into a single, dramatisable event that can be analysed through the lens of kingship.

These characters are kings of historically democratic *poleis*, favourable to Athens, if not Athens itself.¹⁹ Tragedy's good kings can operate only within a democratic setting that enables them to demonstrate that they have declined autocratic power through their willing and reasoned submission to the rule of the many mediated through *logos*. Athens operates as a democracy in its imaginary; the timeless world of civic myth provides a space for exploring the present problems of political life. Thus, for Aeschylus, the good king appears on the tragic stage as a kind of super-citizen (akin to Vidal-Naquet's *roi-hoplite*); his decision to relinquish autocratic power represents a stronger version of the suppression of private interest in favour of public required of all citizens, particularly the aristocratic elite.²⁰

The king and the coherence of the polity: Aeschylus' *Persians*

The city can be seen from outside, as Athens is in Aeschylus' *Persians*. The presentation of Xerxes and Darius provides an opportunity to contrast characters of leadership, the connection between king and country as part and whole, and between king and cosmos, a theme resonant with Greek thought about Near Eastern culture.²¹

Aeschylus' *Persians* is a complex play exploring opposing forms of rule and political cosmologies by taking a historical moment, the defeat of Xerxes'

expeditionary force at Salamis, as a starting point, but pursuing much more abstract concerns about the relationship between cosmos and politics, and the distinctions between types and qualities of rule instantiated in individual rulers, to the extent that it leaves history behind.²² Its political cosmology contrasts models of monarchy, as well as Persia and the democratic polis.²³ It represents a Greek analysis of Persian ideas rather than, as Edith Hall's model suggests, the creation of a Greek response to a separate and separated Persia.²⁴

The differentiation between Athens as a democratic polis and the Persian empire is expressed in many different ways in the play's rich imagery, but the contrast is that of structure and unity, explored through the language of size, number and cohesion, at least as much as the Greek–barbarian cultural contrast emphasised by Hall and others.²⁵ Readings that seek to map the *Persians* to specific conflicts within Athenian politics lose sight of Aeschylus' broader investigation of the workings of power and the creation and maintenance of order.²⁶

The appearance on stage of two kings of Persia, Darius as the revered former king and Xerxes as the present failure, throws two distinct models of kingship into sharp relief.²⁷ Mark Griffith's careful examination of the contrasts between kingly father and son shows how the play's presentation of Persian kingship also explored power in democratic Athens, without being limited to specific politicians or events.²⁸ That the play was also performed in Sicily, suggests that the play has more to offer than patriotic self-congratulation to Athens, with its depictions of two rulers resonant in other political contexts.²⁹ The two forms of kingship are presented in different ways. By presenting Darius as a ghost, honoured and revered since his death and quite terrifying to the chorus (who are too awe-stricken to converse with him), Aeschylus suggests that some aspects of kingship are not attainable at a human level.³⁰

The play's language and imagery of number, multitude and unification exemplify the mereological aspect of the metaphysics of monarchy.³¹ Kings should unite the many into a coherent whole, and then stand over that unity, connecting it to cosmic order. Ordering and unity are repeatedly emphasised, as surmounting or opposed to unstructured multiplicity. Xerxes' failure to create order leads to his defeat and isolation; Darius summarises the power squandered:³²

ἐξ οὗτε τιμὴν Ζεὺς ἀναξ τήνδ' ὥπασεν,
 ἐν' ἄνδρα πάσης Ἀσίδος μηλοτρόφου
 ταγεῖν, ἔχοντα σκῆπτρον εὐθυτήριον

Since lord (*anax*) Zeus granted us this honour,
 that one man should rule over sheep-rearing Asia,
 holding a sceptre of directive authority (*skeptron euthunterion*).

(*Persians* 762–4, tr. Sommerstein)

This emphasises the king's relationship both to the unity of Asia and to the gods; appointed by Zeus, he holds a sceptre that denotes good governance. This is not one of Hesiod's crooked kings.³³ The correctness of the sceptre contrasts with Xerxes' weakness, that he is 'not scrutinised by the city' (οὐχ ὑπεύθυνος πόλει, 213).³⁴

The king is set over the people of the land as a shepherd over the people, an image that recurs through the play, as the chorus first enter (74–5), and in the queen's questioning of the chorus (where it becomes an ironic statement of Athenian difference, 241–4). The land of Attica is a resource for its citizen-rulers, despite its poverty (240), while Persia is a fountain of sorrows (743).³⁵ Xerxes has gone against nature in reshaping the land he has traversed, while Attica contributes to the success of its people (792). The unity of Athenian land and people is politically significant, expressed in the doctrine of autochthony that continued to develop in tragedy and in later Athenian historiography.³⁶

Xerxes' failure is described in metaphysical terms from the outset. His army is vast but not united; the forces are 'uncountable through their mass' (πλήθος τ' ἀνάντιμοι, 40), and a disordered mob (ὄχλος, 42, 53, cf. 936), having number without structure or unity.³⁷ The chorus enters reciting a catalogue of names and cities from the Persian forces, bringing a touch of epic grandeur but also emphasising multiplicity.³⁸ Multitude and abundance are key concepts throughout the play, marked by repeated use of *plēthos* and related terms, both to describe Persia and to express Persian characters' conceptualisation of other places, as when the queen enquires about the 'human resources of the [Athenian] army' (ἀνδροπλήθεια στρατοῦ, 235).³⁹

Multitude and complex abundance are contrasted with emptiness.⁴⁰ The loss of the human riches of Asia is stressed from the opening chorus, and mourned throughout. Asia and its cities have gone from being 'well-peopled' (πολύανδρου, 74) to 'completely empty of men' (πᾶν κενανδρίαν, 730). While Asia remains whole, its quality has altered, its great size and emptiness co-existing as a 'great city empty of men' (κένανδρον μέγ' ἄστν, 119).

The emptying out of Persia mirrors the yoking of separate lands; that which should be separate becomes mixed, while two things that should be together, land and people, are sundered. Xerxes is emphatically 'single and solitary Xerxes without many men' (μονάδα δὲ Ξέρξην ἔρημόν φασιν οὐ πολλῶν μέτα, 734); his entrance dramatises this. Devoid of escorts, he lacks the trappings of royalty and is effectively 'naked' (γυμνός, 1036).⁴¹ He is alone through loss not unification; the Asia to which he has returned is specifically emptied of its men (1000). The language applied to Xerxes refers to solitude, loss and isolation rather than the unique position over the many held by the good ruler.

Darius, on the other hand, represents a process of unification, and the knowledge of the good ruler. The chorus emphasises his creation of a unified polity, a historical perspective extended in Darius' own historical speech (759–86). His ghostly appearance is a stunning theatrical display; speaking from beyond the grave, he displays a different kind of knowledge than that available to the living characters.⁴²

Whether Darius' ghost is summoned as a god or a hero (*isotheos*, 855–6; *isodaimon*, 633), and what the implications are either for Persian religion or Athenian ideas about it, have exercised commentators.⁴³ That Darius' past achievements are idealised, ignoring his defeat at Marathon, and his own efforts in leading armies across bridged water, adds to the problem; the historical Darius may have shared some of the failings of Xerxes, but the returning ghost is not identified with those human failings.⁴⁴

The ghostly Darius differs from the living, including Xerxes, in his knowledge and understanding. Later Greek thought on kingship will emphasise knowledge as the grounds that legitimate royal authority; here the basis of Darius' knowledge remains unclear, although closely connected to the oracles he interprets.⁴⁵ In comparison, Sophocles' depictions of Oedipus further develop the idea of the heroised ruler as possessor of cosmic knowledge, as *Oedipus at Colonus* shows.

Finally, Darius' command that Atossa provide new clothes for Xerxes, who will return in rags (1017, 1030), reintroduces the idea of ordering through another monarchical theme, the self-presentation of the ruler (833–4). The adornment of the king, emphasised by the chorus, represents his cosmological functionality; as Rebecca Futo Kennedy shows in her analysis of the play's twin accounts of kingship, the representation of Darius, with its detailed description of his costume, resembles that of the Achaemenid king as depicted in the sculptures of his palace.⁴⁶ Using clothing to depict order turns the abstract into something that can be seen and performed, an important dramatic consideration.⁴⁷ Xerxes' loss of order is shown through the tearing of his clothes, first in Atossa's dream (199), then in the messenger speech (468), and finally in his appearance on stage.⁴⁸

The two depictions of kingship in the *Persians*, represented by the ghostly Darius, and the living but defeated and battered Xerxes, oppose the good rule of the cosmic king with the failed project of a monarch who fails to heed the limits of good order. The ideal imagined king has unified the polity and connected it to the divine and cosmic order, while the instantiated king has destroyed that unity. Such thought on good governance, and the connection between political and cosmic order, can be universalised and applied to Athens and other polities as well as to Persia itself.

The king as the focus of supplication

While the Persian kings rule without scrutiny, other tragic kings operate in the context of a polis where there is scrutiny. The religious, military and political aspects of monarchical rule are united in the formula for suppliant plays, a pattern of tragedy used by Aeschylus (*Suppliant Women*), Euripides (*Suppliant Women*, *Children of Heracles*) and Sophocles (*Oedipus at Colonus*).⁴⁹ Supplication episodes appear in two of the four canonical great deeds of Athens celebrated in the public funeral speeches, the retrieval of the Argive dead and the help given to the Heracleidae, both of which are dramatised by Euripides.⁵⁰

In these plays, a fugitive or group of fugitives seek the city's protection, through a ritual approach to its ruler. Their supplication will be accepted (after debate); the consequences include debates between the ruler and a representative of those the suppliants are fleeing, and reported battle scenes as the ruler delivers the promised support. The debates enable tragedy to present an effective articulation of political conflict, as each side puts its case; the novel dramatic device of *stichomythia* is ideally suited to representing the face-to-face contact of personal supplication.⁵¹

These plays close with descriptions of the religious benefits that accrue to king and city as a reward for protecting the suppliants, often a protective hero cult (such

as that of Eurystheus in Euripides' *Heracleidae*, Oedipus in Sophocles' *OC*).⁵² All the surviving examples focus on the political mechanisms through which the response to the suppliants is decided, suggesting a link with Athenian civic ideology as well as a live debate in the wartime context of many of these plays.⁵³

But supplication by elite foreigners can expose contrasting loyalties for the monarch, those owed to the city and citizens and those to fellow high-status individuals from elsewhere, with whom there may well be a network of prior familial or *xenia* obligations. Demophon articulates this problem clearly (*Heracleidae* 418–19) and notes that it is likely to spark *stasis*.⁵⁴ Good kings such as Pelasgus and Theseus take the suppliants' case to the democratic decision-making body for a response, even when the actual supplication has taken place within a sanctuary and it is a god or statue that is being supplicated.⁵⁵

Greeks and others: Aeschylus' Suppliants

In the course of presenting the claim for sanctuary made by the daughters of Danaus to Pelasgus, king of Argos, Aeschylus' *Suppliants* presents contrasting models of kingship. The play sets up an opposition between two political cultures, the consensual and consultative versus the absolute and despotic, often associated with Greeks and barbarians in Greek political thinking.⁵⁶ The context of the play's original performance, during the First Peloponnesian War (c. 460–445 BCE), suggests a focus on Athenian political qualities (precisely, the role of democracy, 604), rather than a general reflection on this polarity.⁵⁷ Pelasgus, and Danaus and his daughters, represent distinct conceptualisations of good rule, one linked to the polis and community, the other to the singular power of the monarch in a palace culture.

The daughters of Danaus, fleeing forced marriage to their cousins the *Ægyptioi*, are surprised when Pelasgus refuses to accept their supplication without first consulting the people of Argos. He explains that they are not suppliants at 'the hearth of [his] own household' (365–6); it is the polis that runs the risk of ritual pollution to its communal affairs (*to koinon*, 366), and therefore he must consult the people, whose response will be decisive.⁵⁸

Pelasgus demonstrates his good kingship by being more concerned with the maintenance of collective interest, *to koinon*, than with the exercise of personal power, *kratos*. The concept of *to koinon* is central to the play: it appears first as a royal and religious concern, introduced by Danaus who points to the 'common altar of all lords' (πάντων δ' ἀνάκτων τῶνδε κοινοβωμίαν, 222, suggesting that there may be limits to whose interests are considered *koinon*).⁵⁹ But throughout Pelasgus' confrontation with the suppliants it mutates into a political concept, applicable to the whole citizenry, and ultimately being directly opposed to individual action. This is expressed by the chorus:

φυλάσσοι τ' ἀτρεμαῖα τιμὰς (οἱ φυλάσσοι τ' εὖ τὰ τίμι' ἄστοις),
τὸ δάμιον, τὸ πτόλιν κρατύνει,
προμαθὶς εὐκοινόμητις ἀρχά

May the people, who rule the city guard its offices calmly, good intelligent
rule with foresight in the common interest.

(698–700)

The typically Aeschylean compound *eukoinomētis* suggests that the shared use of the valued quality of intelligence is a good thing for the city, an argument that will later be developed by Aristotle's argument for the 'wisdom of the multitude'.⁶⁰

Pelasgus accepts that the Danaids have 'an ancestral claim to share in the land' (δοκεῖτέ <τοί> μοι τῆσδε κοινωνεῖν χθονὸς/τὰρχαῖον, 325–6) through their descent from Argive princess Io. But as their argument continues, he emphasises his commitment to a shared common good with the citizens, and the importance of shared decision-making:

ἐγὼ δ' ἂν οὐ κραίνοιμ' ὑπόσχεσιν πάρος,
ἄστοις δὲ πᾶσι τῶνδε κοινώσας πέρι.

I would not make a promise, before consulting all the townspeople about
these matters.

(368–9)

The Danaids and Danaus respond that Pelasgus has unique and individual power, in a strong summary description of absolute monarchy:⁶¹

σύ τοι πόλις, σὺ δὲ τὸ δάμιον.
πρύτανις ἄκριτος ὢν,
κρατύνεις βωμόν, ἐστίαν χθονός,
μονοπήφοισι νεύμασιν σέθεν,
μονοσκήπτροισι δ' ἐν θρόνοις χρέος
πᾶν ἐπικραίνεις· ἄγος φυλάσσου.

You are the city, and you are the people.⁶²
You are an unjudged magistrate
You rule the altar, the hearth of the land,
you with your single-vote nods
and on your throne with the sole sceptre
rule over all business.

(373–5)

They link Pelasgus' rule to the hearth and the land (*chthonos*, 372) rather than the community.⁶³ They assert that Pelasgus is 'the city and the public realm', ruling in the singular and identical with the city as a unit and its people as a collective. This identification between individual ruler and city is paralleled by other tragic kings' assessment of their relationship to the polis, notably Oedipus', who argues that his experience of Thebes' plague is different from that of the citizens supplicating him for help; they have only their individual suffering to bear, while he suffers on

behalf of the city as a whole (*OT* 62–4). Kingship is equated with divine absolute authority; the Homeric king's nod, equivalent to the nod with which Zeus exercises authority over the other gods, becomes a single controlling vote (μονονήφοισι).⁶⁴ He holds the only sceptre (μονοσκήπτροισι), a symbol of monarchy associated with the divine gift of power.⁶⁵ The unusual compound adjectives contrast the singular sceptre of the king and plural votes of the people.

The Danaids' construction of a singular royal power draws attention to the one/many problem of the relationship between singular king and multiple populace, central to the problem of the unity of the city, which is resolved through the character of the democratic king. For them (and Sophocles' Oedipus), only the singular entity of the monarch can be equated to the singular entity of the city. His status within the city is different from that of the citizens; he is more like the divine power of Zeus, whose political aspect is emphasised in the closing lyrics (*Zeusanax*, 1062, cf. 689–90). The single ruler is like a god in his relationship to the city; he is not part of it, but a whole that can be equated to it. Choral lyrics (437, 524–6, 816) emphasise the connection between royal and divine rule.

In Pelasgus the king, Aeschylus represents an individual super-citizen who willingly participates in the shared life of the city, and disclaims his personal power in favour of mutuality. While the choral lyrics provide a detailed analysis of the construction of the cosmic king as unifying force, Aeschylus' democratic king is clear in his rejection of them.

The democratic king deconstructed: Euripides' Suppliants

The important Athenian myth of the help the city provided to the defeated Argives in retrieving their dead from the battlefield at Thebes was used by both Aeschylus and Euripides.⁶⁶ Plutarch contrasts Aeschylus' presentation, in which Theseus achieved his goals 'through persuasion' (*peisas*), with Euripides' *Suppliants*, in which he 'won in battle' (μάχη . . . κρατήσας), as reported in the play's messenger speech (Plutarch *Theseus* 29.4–5). This changed focus affects the political depiction of Theseus as king; both the epicising convention of the messenger speech and the heroic vocabulary it deploys (such as *alkimos*, 'mighty', at 727) suggest an archaic view of the role of the king as hero.⁶⁷

But Euripides' Theseus regards *logos* as one of his main tools of leadership. The women's supplication provides the occasion to contrast ethical and political philosophies. Theseus becomes a mouthpiece for the virtues of democracy, and his discussions with his mother, the non-Athenian Aethra (286–364), and two different representatives of tyranny, Adrastus (113–262) and the Theban herald (399–597) demonstrate the role of reasoned debate, and also some movement in Theseus' own account of democracy.⁶⁸

Like Aeschylus, Euripides responds to events in Athenian politics, here changes in the city's diplomatic relationships with Argos and Thebes: the battle of Delium (424 BCE), in which the Thebans refused to hand over the Athenian dead for burial, may have preceded the play's original performance.⁶⁹ Commentators have seen this Theseus as a cipher for Athenian political leaders, particularly Pericles

or his successors, but Athens lacked inspiring leadership at the time of the play's production.⁷⁰ But Theseus himself was a central figure in the city's religion, honoured throughout the year in its festivals and represented on the sculptures of its public buildings, and originator of its unity.⁷¹ In this respect the democratic king Theseus represents the city as a functioning whole. Theseus is an explicit opponent of tyranny, as he sets out in the *agōn* with the Theban herald (442–56); he is addressed as *anax* by the Argive characters, Adrastus (113, 164, 255) and the chorus (367), but never as *turannos*.⁷² Thebes, in turn, is ruled by a tyrant, albeit a 'respectable' (σεμνῶ) one (384).

Adrastus, the Argive leader, describes himself as a *turannos* (166, 1189).⁷³ He claims to act on behalf of the whole city, not in a private capacity (129–30, 163–6), and regards Theseus likewise as representing Athens (113–14); he speaks on behalf of the suppliant women of the chorus much as Aeschylus' Danaus does. Euripides, however, undermines Adrastus' implicit claim to being a good ruler through the careful use of *turannos* vocabulary, and through Theseus' dismissive treatment of him, in excluding him from the *agōn* (513), and emphasising his lack of *euboulia* (161). Theseus criticises Adrastus' earlier choices and behaviour, while presenting himself as a rational leader and decision-maker.⁷⁴

Euripides characterises Theseus positively through his willingness to debate and argue, and embeds philosophical and political motifs within his arguments. The idea of the king as a good adviser and decision-maker is entirely consistent with the kingship ideology of epic, where *euboulia* is one of the qualities of good leaders. Homeric kings should contribute excellent advice to their consultative councils, and listen in turn, although they are not obliged to act on the outcome.⁷⁵ Both Aeschylus' Pelasgus and Euripides' Theseus, unlike Homeric kings, see the decision of the assemblies they consult as binding.

His mother Aethra's emotional appeals, rather than argument, eventually persuade Theseus to take the suppliants' case to the citizens.⁷⁶ In explaining to Aethra that the need to gain the people's approval is mostly a formality, Theseus explains his relationship to Athens and its democracy:

ἀλλὰ τοῦ λόγου
προσδοῦς ἔχοιμ' ἂν δῆμον εὐμενέστερον.
καὶ γὰρ κατέστησ' αὐτὸν ἐς μοναρχίαν
ἐλευθερώσας τήνδ' ἰσόψηφον πόλιν.⁷⁷

But by putting across this argument I would make the people better disposed.
For I put them in the position of holding sole authority When I set free this
city of the equal vote.

(350–3)

While this refers to the synoecism of Athens, it also conceptualises that process as the transmission of monarchical unity to the multiplicity of the people (ἐς πλῆθος ἀστῶν, 355), as he describes them.⁷⁸ The 'city of equal votes' (ἰσόψηφον πόλιν) contrasts with Aeschylus' single-voting king (*Supp.* 373). The continuing presence

of Theseus, and his use of *logos* (350, 354), reinforce his original act of transforming this multiplicity into a monarchy. Without Theseus and his rational *logos*, the demos would remain a disunited *plēthos*, incapable of rational decision; it is the monarch who brings *logos* to the assembly and unites the demos into a single entity capable of rule, a *monarchia*. The *agōn* (*Supp.* 399–597) pits Theseus as a supporter of democracy against the Theban herald, who represents tyranny but also makes the type of case against democracy that one might expect from Athenian oligarchical/aristocratic sources (such as pseudo-Xenophon). In some cases, these arguments bear a close similarity to those Theseus himself has used earlier.

Mills argues that Theseus, the Attic hero turned Panhellenic cult figure, represents ‘a symbol of Athenian virtue’.⁷⁹ In the *agōn* Theseus is looking outwards from Athens and representing it to an external polis, embodying Athens’ self-declared role as protector of Panhellenic values and punisher of transgressions throughout the play, a role in which he claims to have been established permanently (ἀεὶ κολαστής, 341).⁸⁰ Euripides depicts Theseus in relationship to other political leaders as Athens was perceived to stand to other cities, exemplifying rationality.

Theseus instantiates Athens’ cultural, military and political hegemony. In person he exemplifies the characteristics of a good leader, rejecting autocratic kingship and using the best available thoughts and analysis to establish the best action to undertake. In action he shows restraint and moderation, working hard to achieve the accepted goals and not falling prey to individual greed and exceeding his mandate. Just like the middle group within the democracy (244–5), he plays a moderating role, unifying the Athenian polis and protecting its order; however, unlike a tyrant he does so within the rule of law (430–2).⁸¹

Theseus on the tragic stage can never be a cipher for a single politician such as Pericles. He is a heroic figure operating at a different level from the citizens whose democratic unity he both provides and controls. The imaginary king, the king in the imaginary, performs the unifying function that the character Theseus represents on stage, and in dramatising and presenting him the Athenians showed their continuing commitment to the specific role of the king.

Kingship in Sophocles’ Oedipus at Colonus

Sophocles presents a distinctive version of Theseus’ kingship in his final play, *Oedipus at Colonus*, probably written around 406 BCE after the initial loss and restoration of democracy, and amid the defeat of Athens in the Peloponnesian War. The play was first performed posthumously in 401 BCE, at possibly one of the first celebrations of the Great Dionysia after the restoration of the democracy.⁸² The themes and language of the play are redolent of the concerns about civic unity that marked this turbulent decade. The relationship of parts of the city to the whole, whether the inclusion of great men within the polity, the introduction of support from outside, the balancing of competing class interests within the city, are mapped onto the carefully chosen location of the play’s action. The politico-historical background to this play is complex, and has inspired many different readings, often dominated by the Nietzschean view that the play represents a completion and

reversal of the tragedy of Oedipus in Sophocles' earlier *OT*, or by concern about whether Oedipus ends the play as a full Athenian citizen or not.⁸³

The play brings together two important mythical characters, the dying Oedipus of Thebes and Theseus the king of Athens, when Oedipus offers divine protection to the city in return for asylum in Athens. Theseus the king is an important secondary character; in deciding to offer divine protection to Athens, Oedipus judges Theseus against the Theban alternative rulers Creon, the tyrant (*OC* 939–1013), and Polyneices, the would-be oligarch (1285–1345), choosing to favour Athens rather than return to Thebes.⁸⁴ The parade of different political leaders possessing different ethical qualities, by which they can be assessed, becomes a feature of fourth-century political writing in other genres.⁸⁵ Theseus' exemplification of ethical virtue has a political payoff in the legitimation of his city and self by the dying hero, rescuing it from the possibility of mistaken judgements made by the masses.⁸⁶

Sophocles' play confronts a different political situation from that of Euripides' play, performed a couple of decades before. Athens' imperial power was now waning, and further defeat an increasing probability in the aftermath of the failure of the Sicilian Expedition (Thuc. 8.1). Within the city, commitment to political unity was in decline as the restored democracy of 410 failed to re-establish shared values, as seen in the trial of the Arginusae generals in 406.⁸⁷

Sophocles himself was an active politician, a general in 441 BCE and one of the *probouloi*, magistrates charged with increasing political order, in 413–411.⁸⁸ But the political views expressed in this play do not suggest an unwavering commitment to Athenian democracy. Instead, democratic decision-making is represented, via the citizens of the deme of Colonus, at the edge of Athenian territory, as flawed and likely to lead to religious and political disaster, whereas the choices of a single strong leader result in improved protection for the city.

By setting the action in his home deme of Colonus, Sophocles echoes the sanctuary settings of other suppliant plays, but adds a political dimension; Colonus, outside the city walls, is where the pro-oligarchs moved the assembly to at the start of the 411–410 oligarchy (Thuc. 8.67.2).⁸⁹ At the start of the play, Theseus is off-stage, sacrificing in the nearby sanctuary of Poseidon Hippios (54–5); this cult was closely associated with the cavalry and the elite.⁹⁰ The liminal geo-political location of Colonus becomes the intersection between political Athens and the external world, and also somewhere distinct from the city of Athens itself.⁹¹ Vidal-Naquet argues that the play's preoccupation with these spaces and with separation extends to the distance it places between the principal actors and the chorus.⁹²

Again, the play begins with the presentation of the suppliants, in this case Oedipus, and the potential rejection of their case. But the political concerns are raised immediately, as Oedipus asks the stranger about the political arrangements of the place where he has arrived (66–9);

ἄρχει τις αὐτῶν, ἢ 'πὶ τῷ πλήθει λόγος;

Is there a person who rules, or does power of discussion rest with the multitude?
(66)

The stranger emphasises that there is a *basileus* (67), attributing *logos* to the king rather than to the multitude; Oedipus' next question brings in the qualities Euripides attributes to Theseus' rule, '*logos* and strength' (λόγῳ τε καὶ σθένει, 68). The opposition between ruler and ruled, and the possession of *logos* by the single ruler rather than the multiple rule, is established in the opening scene, and immediately becomes the focus. In this play it is the people, not the monarch, who risk making the wrong decision, reversing the concern of Aeschylus' and Euripides' monarchs that the people's decisions should take precedence. The collective political action of the people is represented on stage by the chorus, demesmen of Colonus; unlike the other two plays, this play has a chorus not of female suppliants but of male citizens.

The chorus makes the collective decision to reject Oedipus, once they have discovered his identity, because of their concern over the threat of pollution (229–36). But their decision is challenged by Theseus the king, arriving from the centre of Athens. The city's synoecism is a recent event, and new power structures not yet firmly routinised. As the play progresses, and the men of Colonus accede to Theseus' decision to accept Oedipus, the chorus' Athenian rather than local identity is emphasised. In the opening scene they are attached to Colonus, are described as 'demesmen from this same place and not from the city' (τοῖς ἐνθάδ' αὐτοῦ μὴ κατ' ἄστν δημόταις, 78) but later they term themselves 'citizens' (*politai*, 1095) and are addressed as such by the messenger (1579).

When Theseus single-handedly overturns their decision and begins to deal with the tragic Oedipus himself (551–68), his first-person verbs emphasise the quality of his *logos* and knowledge ('I knew . . . I understand', ἐγνωνκά . . . ἐξεπίσταμαι, 553–4) compared with those of the chorus/multitude.⁹³ However, his military skill is emphasised; he is addressed as *koiranos* by both Polyneices (1287) and Antigone (1759), and the messenger speech reports his action in retrieving Oedipus' daughters when they are kidnapped by the Thebans.

The relationship between Oedipus and Theseus is delicate and nuanced, changing during the course of the play; Oedipus' power grows as his death approaches, and after Theseus has accepted him as a suppliant.⁹⁴ The relationship has been characterised in many ways. Blundell, for example, emphasises its connection with the traditional ethics of helping friends (and Oedipus regards himself as having an existing claim on Theseus, 569–74).⁹⁵ Others have sought to read the relationship between the two as an establishment of *xenia* relations, not an act of supplication.⁹⁶ But as the earlier plays showed, the *xenia* relationships between the aristocratic or regal parties in a supplication complicates the civic process of granting asylum or the protection of a democratic city. Sophocles highlights the *xenia* relationships to emphasise that the two great mythical figures meet in some respects as equals, both clearly superior to the demesmen chorus.

Sophocles' bleak political vision sees Oedipus reject the tyrant and the oligarch in favour of the ideal monarch represented by Theseus; an ideal monarch who clearly operates in a different world from that of democratic politics. Oedipus chooses to favour with his posthumous protection not just the city of Athens, but also its rulers on a personal basis. The protection will be transmitted through Theseus.

The final part of the play, in which Oedipus dies and transmits his protection to Athens through Theseus, uses cult and mystery imagery to emphasise the special status of the king. The protection that Oedipus grants to Athens is transmitted through Theseus (1518–19, 1526–32); he imparts the religious mysteries to Theseus alone, to be passed ‘to his successor on an individual basis’ (τῷ προφερτάτῳ μόνῳ, 1531).⁹⁷ Is Sophocles arguing for a single leader? There is a possible pro-democracy reading of this – Theseus has become the Athenian *basileus* as the annual archon in charge of older celebrations, handing on his religious authority to his successors in turn – but in the dark context of this play, in which Theseus has already been shown overturning the majority verdict of the demesmen in accepting Oedipus as a suppliant, there may be an anti-democratic claim here about the preferred rule of the expert, philosopher king.⁹⁸ The superlative προφερτάτῳ (1531) could mean either ‘eldest’, implying a monarchical succession, or ‘most outstanding’, implying an aristocratic one.

One might argue, by analogy with the elision between individual and collective autochthony in Athenian thought, that in the context of the Athenian imaginary all Athenians are Theseus’ descendants and successors (and as Blundell and Easterling note, no specific familial descendants are specified), but the distinction drawn between the Athenian centre personified by Theseus and the demesmen of Colonus makes it more credible to read this play as at best ambivalent towards democracy, and possibly advocating monarchical authority in the polis.⁹⁹

Kingship and autochthony

Theseus’ claim to good kingship is grounded in his role as synoecist and further evidenced by his adept management of religious and political crises. Athens’ other good kings have their status (literally) grounded in their autochthonous origin, a greater force for unity than the political process of synoecism.¹⁰⁰ Tragedy develops the concept of autochthony as an origin specific to kings, while comedy explores the autochthony claims of all Athenian citizens, two distinctive approaches to autochthony seen throughout Greek mythology.¹⁰¹ While Pelasgus and Theseus in the suppliant plays presented themselves as rational politicians rather than cosmic kings, the associations of kingship with the divine are re-emphasised in myths of the autochthonous kings. Erechtheus, like Theseus, was a continuing presence in Athenian iconography and ritual, and there is evidence that these foundation myths were emphasised in the turbulent political environment of the Peloponnesian War.¹⁰²

Tragedy’s kings sometimes represent all Athenian citizens, providing the conduit for the citizens’ autochthonous relationship to Attica.¹⁰³ Euripides returns to the theme in the *Ion*.¹⁰⁴ But the *Erechtheus* represents a different use of kingship from that found in the Theseus plays, one in which the king as embodiment of civic unity and cosmic order receives much more emphasis, and is distinguished from the citizens. The metaphysical equation between royal household and city becomes much more explicit in dramatic themes such as the sacrifice of Erechtheus’ daughter on behalf of the city, the theme of the long fragment quoted by Lycurgus (*Against Leocrates* 100).

Athens has (at least) two autochthonous royal founders, but a weaker tradition of collective emergence from the ground for its citizens, in contrast with the story of the Theban Spartoi, sprung from the teeth of the dragon slain by Cadmus. Vincent Rosivach argues that the two types of autochthony, being *gēgeneis* (earth-born), and being from the same country (i.e. always having lived in the same place, his interpretation of *autochthōn*), should be carefully distinguished. The consequences for Athenian democracy both of this distinction, and its conflation in Euripidean tragedy, can be developed further.¹⁰⁵

Tragic leaders appeal to a more figurative tradition of collective autochthony; the idea that the Athenians were nurtured by the ground of their *patris* often appears within the speeches of Athenian leaders; the messenger reports Demophon's pre-battle speech to the Athenians: 'Fellow citizens, now we must defend the land that both nourishes (βοσκούσῃ) and gives birth (τεκούσῃ)' (*Heracleidae* 826–7). The nurturing land is personified as a kourotrophic goddess (usually Gē or Athena; both appear in vase paintings of the birth of Erichthonius).¹⁰⁶ Athena too is addressed as the mother of the city by the chorus of *Heracleidae* (770–6).¹⁰⁷

However, just as the Thebans are collectively referred to as the Spartoi, the Athenians are identified as Erechtheidae, in tragedy and elsewhere; the autochthonous origins of the founder king are transferred to the people as a whole.¹⁰⁸ Tragedy presents the qualities of the imaginary monarch as potentially instantiated in its Athenian audience as the heirs of Erechtheus; comedy presents this as problematic, with Aristophanes depicting Demos as failing to respond when addressed as an Erechtheid (*Knights* 1015–30).¹⁰⁹ Euripides' claim that the Athenians' autochthonous qualities are transmitted through their mythical monarchs perhaps failed to influence the collective political imaginary, just as his claim for Ion as an Athenian king fathered by Apollo was not incorporated into the standard body of Athenian foundation myth.

This contrasts with the collective autochthons, the Spartoi; from the Athenian tragic perspective, collective autochthonous origin does not produce a collective political identity as a *demos* for the sown men of Thebes, but their story becomes one of oligarchic faction and political failure as they fight each other to the death, the few survivors carrying an inheritance of strife into the continuing story of Thebes.¹¹⁰ This carries through into the depiction of Thebes as a city of bad governance. Some non-human *gēgeneis*, such as the Erinyes and the Giants, are a source of strife in the world.¹¹¹

Collective emergence from the earth is contested in Athenian ideology; while the tragedians seek to supplant it with the singular autochthony of the monarch, Plato would reconfigure it in creating a new set of foundation myths for his proposed Kallipolis (*Republic* 414de), where collective autochthony is held to produce equality and shared values among the citizens, born from the same earth and therefore brothers.¹¹²

The challenge faced by Erechtheus the autochthonous king in the *Erechtheus* is similar to that faced by Demophon in the *Heracleidae*; a god demands the sacrifice of a child in return for protection for Athens from an invading force. Demophon takes the decision that he will not sacrifice a child (403–18), and is rescued from

politico-religious impasse by the voluntary self-sacrifice of one of the daughters of Heracles (476–83). This legitimated exchange of a life for the city contrasts with Agamemnon's exchange of Iphigenia for favourable winds for his expedition to Troy, a private, family concern.¹¹³

In the *Erechtheus*, as in the *Suppliants*, Euripides allots some of the work of the monarchical figure to a female royal, in this case Praxithea, the wife of Erechtheus, who outlines the positive case for exchanging the life of a child for the security of the city (Fr. 360N), probably in response to Erechtheus' articulation of the divine demand.¹¹⁴ Praxithea argues that the city is a single entity containing many people, and so exchanging one child for its safety will benefit many, with only a single family being disadvantaged (360.16–21). She summarises this claim and her sense of obligation:

ἀντὶ γὰρ ψυχῆς μιᾶς
οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ τήνδ' ἐγὼ σώσω πόλιν.

For is not possible that I would not save this city, at the price of a single life (*psuchēs mias*).

(360.50–2)

The idea that the city is a unity set over its people, but that it can also be equated to a single life, is made clear. However, the papyrus fragments of the closing scenes, where Praxithea begins to realise that she has lost more than one daughter and that Poseidon has destroyed her husband, suggest that she found the exchange more problematic than her earlier pragmatic utilitarianism suggested (370.36–44).¹¹⁵

Erechtheus himself provides an outline of his political views when he addresses an unnamed *teknon* with his thoughts on the character of the good ruler (Fr. 362N); these qualities could apply to pre-eminent democratic politicians, but the familial context suggests otherwise. The identity of this *teknon* is unknown – in some sources Erechtheus has only daughters, rather than sons – but Goossens regards the address as made to the audience of Athenian citizens in their collective role as successors to the kings.¹¹⁶ The speech uses some of the same arguments against tyranny that Theseus presents in the *Suppliants*, and shows the same concern with the balance between opposed extremes of wealth/class (362N.6–7) and preventing the interests of youth from prevailing within the city (21–4). Much of Erechtheus' advice concerns being a good king, by avoiding tyrannical greed (11–17) and sexual disorder (αἰσχροῦς ἔρωτας, 24–5), and by preventing the wicked from acquiring too great a share of resources or power (28–31).

These views resemble those developed later by Xenophon and Isocrates, in their virtue model of kingship.¹¹⁷ Just as Theseus' praise for the moderating influence of the middle classes seems suspiciously akin to later political ideas, Erechtheus' speech here either prefigures a template that would be much used in the following century, or more likely incorporates additions made for fourth-century productions of the play, updating his character to incorporate the latest theory on what a king might say. The presence of interpolated later dialogue within Euripides' plays

provides some evidence for the continuing use of tragedy within fourth-century Athenian political culture to represent kings, with a changed role. Where the *Suppliants*' Theseus was the embodiment of the collective citizenry, and spoke on behalf of them, Euripides had already presented Erechtheus as separate from the citizens, and subsequently inserted dialogue increases the distinction.

Cosmology and comedy

While tragedy mediates the analysis of Athenian communal and civic concerns through the retelling of myth, comedy often makes the connection between myth and contemporary Athens more explicit, both through settings of the play and characters and through direct references. The close integration between old comedy as dramatic form and as Athenian public ritual, as well as the frequent parodies of tragic scenes and dialogues, link comedy closely to myth, even when plays are set in apparently non-mythical settings such as the Athenian courts and home.¹¹⁸ Comedy's ability to restructure mythemes, especially those used by tragedy, enables it to analyse and criticise its own society.¹¹⁹

Comedy explores the relationship between cosmic order (and the divine kingship of Zeus) and human political order within the polis, drawing in turn on (didactic) epic and other traditions. Where tragedy explores the qualities of the good king within the framework of the polis, contrasting it with the heroic society of its mythical narratives, comedy makes the contrast between human and cosmic social and political structures much more explicit. Although it is hard to draw firm conclusions from the fragmentary remains of other comedians' work, there seems to be a persistent interest in golden age themes, particularly that of abundance of resources such as food: the representation and re-enactment of ritual can also be seen to draw on Hesiod and other sources which link kingship and golden-age prosperity.¹²⁰

The availability of non-heroic characters and everyday settings to Aristophanes should perhaps make the use of myth irrelevant to his political analysis, but the importance of myth in the construction of the Athenian political imaginary necessitates Aristophanes' engagement with the civic myths explored in tragedy. But Aristophanes' plays mix and mediate the everyday with the ritual, religious and mythical, and Aristophanes engages with the mythical narratives of his literary predecessors, most notably Hesiod, as part of his political analysis and response to their analysis.¹²¹ Mythical narratives provide a way to present and to explore the political role of the individual within the polis, and the relationship of individual to polis, as well as providing a natural fit with the ritual aspects of the structure of Old Comedy.

Comedy seems to make the link between kingship and the gods much more explicit than the tragedians do, and also emphasises the status of Zeus as king of the gods.¹²² Again, this can be related to Hesiodic interest in the parallels between human and divine rule.¹²³ Aristophanes' characters address only gods, particularly Zeus, as *basileus*, whereas they address a wider range of gods, heroes and human masters as *anax*.¹²⁴ When Philocleon compares his *arche* to that of a king (*Wasps*

548–9), the king he has in mind is Zeus (*Wasps* 619–24), a comparison which may be ambivalent between good and bad kingship.¹²⁵ Peisetairos' ascent to rule over the birds is represented as a struggle between generations of gods, in which Zeus' potentiality for tyranny is not ignored, as the close links between the play and ps-Aeschylus *Prometheus Bound* suggest.¹²⁶ The distinction between kingship among gods and men is one that Aristophanes uses to critique the limits of order in human society and the frailty of humans exposed to power.¹²⁷

The wealth of political detail and language in the surviving work both of Aristophanes and of other comedians suggests that politics was always a central concern of comedy, beyond the obvious invective against current politicians in the democratic polis.¹²⁸ Aristophanes' comic heroes and anti-heroes (and heroines) perform political actions (much like those of his contemporaries and rivals), such as founding cities, arranging peace treaties, educating their children and participating in the assembly and courts; they assess the quality of Athenian political life, and engage with the intellectual culture of Athens. These actions may track current political and military events, as has been suggested for Aristophanes' *Birds* and the fortification of the border fort of Decelea.¹²⁹ Aristophanes' own political preferences have proven elusive; it is more useful to recognise the ambiguous portrayal of ideologies through characters, such as Philocleon in the *Wasps*, or through settings such as the 'cloud cuckoo-land' of the *Birds*.¹³⁰ Aristophanes' critical exploration of tensions and differences within Athenian ideology need not tie him to a particular perspective. But his concern with the quality of public debate within the city, and the education of its participating citizens, anticipates the concerns of Plato, Xenophon and Isocrates.¹³¹

Comic political thinking is often presented largely outside the 'real' city, often located within imaginary, ambiguous spaces such as Nephelokokkugia, or versions of Athens so fantastical that they cannot be claimed as a realistic representation of a historical space, such as the 'thinkery' (*phrontistērion*) in *Clouds* or Philocleon and Bdelycleon's house in *Wasps*.¹³²

The *Wasps* dramatises both the direct relationship of individual citizen to polis within the context of participatory democracy, through the contrasted father and son characters Philocleon and Bdelycleon, and the competition between different Athenian ideologies articulated by the pair. There has been some dispute over the ideas represented by the two characters; Konstan sees pro- and anti-democratic views, while Olson (less plausibly) argues that Aristophanes is opposing the views of more and less radical takes on democracy.¹³³ Hutchinson shows how the two characters represent different conceptions of the relationship between individual citizen, *oikos* and *polis*.¹³⁴

Philocleon is crafty and resourceful, as an Athenian citizen should be (which links him firmly to Odysseus), but also devoted to participation in the jury courts, which in turn is a cipher for democratic participation.¹³⁵ Although he is defeated in the *agōn*, and re-educated in the second half of the play through the in-house trial and attendance at an aristocratic-style symposium, the closing rejuvenation scene, in which Philocleon rejects the polite society his son has attempted to introduce him to, suggests that Aristophanes may have some affection for the traditional Athenian mentality that his character represents.

Bdelycleon's apparent rejection of the public world and preference for the private, suggests a link to the other kind of single-person rule, tyranny. This link is made explicit from the outset by the chorus, who analyse his political attitudes in the introduction to the *agōn*. They describe him as a 'hater of the city' and someone who 'hated the demos' but is a 'lover of monarchy' (ἄνδρα μισόπολιν, 411; ὃ μισόδημε καὶ μοναρχίας ἐραστά, 473) and his ideas as 'open tyranny' (τυραννίς . . . ἐμφανής, 417, 463–5).¹³⁶ The chorus questions his interference:

οὔτε τιν' ἔχων πρόφασιν
οὔτε λόγον εὐτράπελον,
αὐτὸς ἄρχων μόνος;

Ruling alone by yourself, with neither any excuse nor any ready argument.
(468–70)

The positive presentation of Bdelycleon's views is that he is a quietist who professes disdain for the public realm and seeks to remove his father into the private, elite world of refined symposia and non-participation (715–24, 1256–61).¹³⁷ His (oligarchical, anti-democratic) political sympathies are shown by his adoption of Spartan and Persian fashions (noted by the chorus, 466, 475–6), which he later attempts to impose on Philocleon as part of his re-education (1133–69). Just as Strepsiades and Pheidippides in the *Clouds* mapped different approaches to education, the father–son pair here shows different attitudes to political participation belonging to two competing ideologies.¹³⁸

Philocleon regards his status as an active Athenian citizen as being comparable to that of a god, in particular to Zeus, king of the gods (619–27).¹³⁹ He claims that the (collective) power exercised by an Athenian juror is like that of a monarch (548–9), and unlike other forms of civic authority is not subject to scrutiny (587).¹⁴⁰ The idea of the king as a super-citizen, the person who most fully displays the qualities and capabilities of the ideal Athenian citizen, emerging in Euripides' plays of the same era, is pushed to its (comic) limits in the person of Philocleon. The citizen-king can be seen simultaneously as a god and a tyrant, just as Theseus' demos has been established in an ambivalent and undefined *monarchia* (*Supp* 355). The use of Zeus as king and tyrant as a comparator for Athenian rulers was a familiar device in Old Comedy, at least discernible from fragments of Cratinus and Eupolis where Zeus and Pericles are linked.¹⁴¹

Bdelycleon, however, rejects the idea of the citizen-king as instantiated in his father and the likes of the wasp jurors; he inverts and replaces it with the idea of the citizen-slave (515–19), which he develops through the *agōn*, in an argument described as an 'extraordinarily dark analysis of the "real workings" of the contemporary Athenian democracy'.¹⁴² Bdelycleon argues that citizens virtually prostrate themselves to the demagogues (προσκυνεῖς, 516), whereas Philocleon gloated that defendants have to supplicate him as a juror (ἰκετεύουσιν θ' ὑποκύπτοντες, 555). Is the Athenian citizen a king to be supplicated, or a slave prostrating himself to

an absolute ruler? The kingship imagery that runs throughout the *agōn* brings the contrast to life.¹⁴³

By participating in politics, men like Philocleon are acting as slaves to the demagogues who control Athenian political life (682–95). Aristophanes allows this view to prevail in the *agōn*, and subsequent re-education scenes. However, the complex interchange of the play suggests that Bdelycleon's persuasive arguments, which reverse the opinions of the chorus, are themselves an example of the type of public speech he criticises.¹⁴⁴ After hearing his arguments, the chorus, which had earlier identified him as a demos-hating tyrant, praise his arguments and the ideas they contain (729–35); before the *agōn*, the quality that was manifest in Bdelycleon was tyranny, whereas at the end of the *agōn* he is described as 'with a manifestly present god' (σοὶ δὲ νῦν τις θεῶν παρὼν ἐμφανής, 733). The chorus's final comment shows that their perception of Bdelycleon has been altered, and that they have begun to 'perceive that he really loves the demos', like no other member of the younger generation (τὸν δῆμον ἡσθόμεσθ' αὖ σου/φιλοῦντος, 887–90).

The contrast between Bdelycleon's wealth and Philocleon's apparent poverty has confused interpreters who seek to find a realist interpretation that explains Philocleon's apparently irrational preference for the life of a poor juror. That Philocleon belongs to a grand household complicates his identification with the poor citizen-wasps who make up the chorus. But the distinction between father and son is not really intended to have a rational explanation any greater than that of different generations' approaches to money – Philocleon's apparent poverty compares to Bdelycleon's extravagant lifestyle much as the cultures of 1950s austerity clashed with the later never-had-it-so-good years.

Carrière argues that the key to the play lies in the final rejuvenation scene (1474–1575), in which the presence of Dionysus plays a role in bringing Philocleon back to youthful liveliness, exemplifying the combination of ritual kingship with the analysis of political kingship.¹⁴⁵ The carnival-king of the world turned upside down is the same person as the real king of Athens, the individual participating citizen.¹⁴⁶ The combined citizen-king/carnival-king shows his identification with Athenian public life by dismounting the stage and going down into the orchestra to dance with the chorus.¹⁴⁷ Although Goldhill cautions against the conflation of Old Comedy with later carnival traditions, and against the incautious application of Bakhtin's concept of the carnivalesque to Aristophanes, the combination does seem powerful.¹⁴⁸

While the *Wasps* explores the idea of the citizen as king or tyrant within the context of Athens, the *Birds* leaves the city as part of an exploration of utopian political theory. Utopian themes were an established sub-genre of comedy to which Aristophanes and the other comic poets returned frequently, often as part of an explicit contrast with current Athenian politics.¹⁴⁹ Utopian discourses were an established form of political writing, exemplified by the model ideal cities developed by Plato and Aristotle, and in lost *politeia* texts; that Plato's Kallipolis draws on similar traditions to Praxagora's Athens (*Ecclesiastuzae* 583–688) has long been recognised.¹⁵⁰

Aristophanes may be using the genre of utopian writing to explore the political thought of Athenian factions, rather than to suggest that there is a concrete alternative. Commentators note the play's lack of a close connection to political events of 414 BCE, but this is not because the play is not about political actions; it is an exploration of theory, not practice, or rather an exploration through a mythical utopia of what might happen if certain ideas current in Athens did get put into practice.¹⁵¹ Dover notes that the Sicilian expedition was yet to get into serious difficulties;¹⁵² the parallel with the Spartan fortification of Decelea in 413 is interesting, but not necessarily significant for the argument of the play. While any reading that forces a direct parallel between Alcibiades and Peisetairos will struggle with the distinct characterisation of the latter as an old man, Aristophanes does explore the rhetoric of anti-democratic factions at Athens, particularly through Peisetairos' political language and manipulation of political imagery in the *agon*.

Kingship among the gods is again contrasted with human tyranny. Here, two disaffected Athenians (repelled by jurors, 109–10, possibly as victims of the courts, 114–16) found a utopian city in the sky, but at the same time as their re-founded city of the birds enables them to overturn the power of the Olympian gods, a worrying undercurrent of tyranny suggests that not all is well within the new city.¹⁵³ City foundation stories often contain stories of ideal kings, as the mythicised oikist is recast – as in Pindar's retelling of Cyrene's foundation myths, for example (*Pythian* 5), or Herodotus' accounts of Cyrene and other cities.¹⁵⁴ In this play, Peisetairos clearly believes that he is undertaking a noble venture, and his delusion is never dispelled. He presents his clearly tyrannical acts, such as his roasting and consumption of birds from an emergent anti-democratic opposition (who have 'risen up and wronged (*adikein*) the democratic birds' (1583–5), as democratic consensus. But he also manages to secure his status as a ruler through his marriage to Basileia (1706–65).

Again, Aristophanes' comic presentation contains a great deal of political ambivalence; just as the sophistic youngsters win the debate while the wily older generation win the ritual in *Wasps*, here the victory of Peisetairos over the Olympian gods is problematic. Aristophanes uses the conflict he dramatises between different types of kingship to explore the ideology of a section of the Athenian elite in the aftermath of the events of 415 BCE. He emphasises that the new city is neither Athens nor Sparta (812–14); the comparison is with Laconists' imaginary Sparta.¹⁵⁵ Back in Athens, the herald confirms, 'Laconomania' has been replaced by 'ornithomania' (1280–85).¹⁵⁶ Among the gods, democracy is despised for its inefficiencies; Poseidon complains that democratic processes have allotted him a barbarian god as part of his negotiating team (1570–4). Rule by the Zeus-led Olympians may be a democracy of sorts but just like imperialist Athens, it is also a tyranny.

Peisetairos, as his speaking name might suggest, is not an Athenian Everyman, but a disaffected political partisan (perhaps the kind who became involved with the *hetaireiai* of 411) withdrawing from his city's political life (27–38), while clearly not losing his interest in winning political power.¹⁵⁷ Tereus immediately identifies him as someone who wishes to found an aristocracy (122–6) rather than to seek

the quiet life (42–5); by the end of the play, he has usurped tyranny over the birds (1643, 1672, 1708).

A characteristic of Greek traditional and conservative political thought is the appeal to a past age of peace, plenty and political stability, under the heritage of a strong lawgiver.¹⁵⁸ Peisetairos argues that the birds, rather than the gods were the original rulers of humans, before the Titans and Olympians (465–523); his offer to the birds is to re-establish their rule through the foundation of a ‘single city’ of birds (μίαν ὀρνίθων πόλιν, 550; οἰκίσσατε μίαν πόλιν, 172). In contrast to Tereus, the ineffectual leader of a loosely constructed ethnos, Peisetairos can act as a founder and synoecist and create a unified city.¹⁵⁹

Peisetairos presents the birds’ former rule as *basileia* rather than *turannis* (467, 478, 486, 499–500, 503, 508, 514, 515); only when describing their rule over Persia is it a tyranny (483). The contrast is between the current politics of imperial Athens, simultaneously democracy and tyranny under a single leader, compared with the collective rule of the (imaginary) past, like that of the pre-Olympian Titans. Peisetairos is keen to present his imagined golden age of the birds as a good form of rule, asserting its collective nature, origin in a golden age, and also through the use of words relating to *basileia*, that it is a non-tyrannical form of *politeia*.

This collective rule of the birds that Peisetairos describes can be contrasted with the personal tyranny that he constructs and performs as the play progresses, supervising the building of the city and the closure of its borders to men and gods. His monarchy is ultimately personified as Basileia and represented by the sceptre of Zeus (480, 1535, 1600, 1626). In turn, this is contrasted with the birds’ own claim to power, which they assert after Peisetairos has persuaded them of this claim.¹⁶⁰

The chorus in the parabasis first holds out the offer to the Athenian audience that the former world can be recreated (685–736), but with the birds ruling in a less distant way than Zeus does (727–8).¹⁶¹ The *epirrhome* (685–723) draws from a range of cosmogonies including those of Hesiod, Orphism and various pre-Socratic philosophies, suggesting that the chorus has accepted Peisetairos’ persuasion. The *antepirrhome* (753–69, 785–800) suggests comic ways in which an Athenian citizen would benefit from having birdlike qualities, such as the ability to fly. Just as the two halves of the parabasis express the breadth of reference of Aristophanic comedy, Aristophanes sets the collective idyll of the golden age of the birds and the lurch of the new city into tyranny in the action that follows against each other.

Peisetairos’ grasp of sole charge of the city, and beyond that of the cosmos as a whole, is represented by his marriage to Basileia, a personification of the abstract concept of monarchical rule, even though here the *politeia* attained more like a tyranny. Attempts to match Basileia to an existing character, or goddess, have been unsuccessful; Sommerstein translates the character as ‘Princess’ and downplays the political significance. Others have linked her to a range of goddesses from Athena to Hera, and also to Pandora.¹⁶² However, abstract concepts represented by silent female characters are a feature of old comedy.¹⁶³

With the *Birds* Aristophanes provides a subtle exploration of the potential for utopian programmes to degenerate from the planned recreation of a golden age

into a tyranny similar to failed human societies in general, and possible Athens in particular. The good monarchy of the ancient gods is not accessible to Peisetairos, and so the constitution which he implements for his bird-city, as a human copy of Zeus' rule, is perhaps inevitably a tyranny. As the sacred marriage is celebrated, he is hailed as a *turannos* (1673, 1708).

Comedy's links to ritual and deep indebtedness to the religious and social ideas of early epic provide Aristophanes with a model of ideal kingship among the gods, with which he can contrast humans who fail to reach that ideal. Philocleon's claim to Zeus-like power is simultaneously an expression of the unjust power of the courts, and of Philocleon's own delusions about the extent to which ordinary citizens had any independent power to wield. Bdelycleon and Peisetairos each demonstrate an interest in non-democratic ideas that potentially lead to tyranny. Peisetairos himself manipulates ideas about political and cosmic order to persuade the birds to let him re-found their city as a vehicle for his own tyrannical ideas.

Conclusion

Tragedy's democratic kings enabled the dramatists to explore the dynamics of political participation within a heroic setting, but they also highlight the difficulty for democracy of expressing the unity of the city and the incorporation of individual 'great men' leaders such as Pericles within collective decision-making and life. Aeschylus seems to look forward to a democracy that will express the values of Greek culture within the polis, while Euripides and Sophocles respond to the Peloponnesian War with more pessimistic accounts.

Athenian myth provides a flexible starting point for tragedians to explore arguments about the relative claim of individual and collective, and the strengths of kingship, freighted with the added significance of divine. Presenting the good king on the democratic stage enables the qualities an impossible real king might bring to be activated within the Athenian democratic political imaginary; by representing itself as the home of good monarchy, the polis achieves the unity and stability associated with good kingship without exposing itself to the politically unacceptable consequences of single-person rule. But grounding democracy in a monarchical inheritance undermines democracy's own claims to legitimacy, a negative aspect of 'democratic kings' that emerges in Sophocles' and Euripides' work. Fourth-century historical explorations of this theme develop this aspect.

Notes

- 1 P. Wilson 2000, 2009.
- 2 There is the problematic possibility of later interpolations in the texts, but the democratic king of tragedy plays a distinctive structural role not dependent on specific speeches (Kovacs 1982; Page 1934; Podlecki 2004).
- 3 Davie 1982; Easterling 1985; Goossens 1932: 21; Hall 1989: 192; Parker 1996: 170. Pelling (2000: 164–5) argues that the representation of democracy in tragedy is blurred and non-specific. Labelling the kings as 'anachronistic' ignores the transformation

between the temporalities of historical city and mythical stage already performed (Easterling 1985).

- 4 Kearns 1989: 85–9; cf. the invocation of kings and tribal connections to them in [Dem.] 60.27–31.
- 5 Carrière 1979 connects Athenian comedy to the Bakhtinian carnivalesque.
- 6 Lefort 1988; see Introduction.
- 7 Vidal-Naquet 1996: 10, introducing Calame's survey of Theseus myth in the Athenian political imaginary, Calame 1996.
- 8 Goldhill 1987, 2000; Seaford 2000; contra Griffin 1998; Rhodes 2003. See also D.M. Carter 2011, especially Burian 2011: 95–9.
- 9 Goldhill 1987; Parker 2007: 136–52.
- 10 That tragedy functions as exploration of the imaginary may explain the Athenians' difficulties with history plays such as Phrynichus' *Phoenissae* (see Roisman 1988).
- 11 Castoriadis 2007, 2008; see Introduction. Not all interventions (such as those of Euripides' *Ion*) succeeded in gaining broad acceptance; but the continual contest for the imaginary showed that introducing change was possible.
- 12 Loraux 1993b, 2000; Montanari 1981; Rosivach 1987. See also Calame 2011.
- 13 Galinsky 1972: 63–6; Mills 1997: 136–7; Walker 1994: 127–32.
- 14 Mills 1997: 155–6.
- 15 Podlecki 1986: 85–6.
- 16 Carlier 1984: 151–77; Mitchell 2013: 23–32.
- 17 Goldhill 2000; Griffith 1995; Pope 1986: 21.
- 18 Genealogy may impose a burden, as with the inherited familial curse that emerges in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (see Gagné 2013).
- 19 Although Aeschylus places both good kings (Pelagus), and clearly bad autocrats (Aegisthus) in Argos, the Athenian king offering refuge is the most common instance of the good tragic king.
- 20 Vidal-Naquet 1996: 10, cf. Vidal-Naquet 2002.
- 21 However, it is difficult to establish what Aeschylus (or Herodotus) knew about non-Greek thought on kingship (see Kennedy 2013). Garvie suggests that the play has a Greek rather than Persian perspective (Garvie 2009: xii–xiv).
- 22 Lockwood 2018.
- 23 Aeschylus' connection with Presocratic cosmological ideas is explored by Seaford (Seaford 2003b, 2012) and Gagarin (Gagarin 1976: 31–56).
- 24 Hall 1989: 56–8, 69–78, cf. Cartledge 2002b: 54; Loraux 1993a.
- 25 See Michelini 1982 on the imagery of multitude and abundance, and Harrison on its historical significance (2000: 66–75), with further comment from Avery 1964; Ghezzo 1938–39; Saïd 2007.
- 26 As Podlecki 1966: 8–26 does; Pelling 1997b; Harrison 2000: 25–39; Garvie 2009: xvi–xxii argue against such strongly historicist readings, while Griffith 1998 shows the relevance of the kingship theme to Athenian citizens.
- 27 Gagarin 1976: 31–56; Hall 1989: 69–76; Meier 1993: 71–4; Podlecki 1993: 58–62.
- 28 Griffith 1998.
- 29 Belloni 1994: xliii. Kathryn Morgan notes parallels with Pindar's roughly contemporary *First Pythian* ode (Morgan 2015: 96–8, cf. Bosher 2012).
- 30 Alexanderson 1967.
- 31 Michelini 1982: 86–94.
- 32 These lines have been compared with Darius' Bisitun inscription; Broadhead 1960: 191, citing Keiper 1877: 41.
- 33 Belloni 1994: xxiii–xxvi. Zeus is himself a severe judge, εὐθνοὺς βαρὺς (828); see Harrison 2000: 90–1.
- 34 Garvie 2009: 316–17; Goldhill 1988.
- 35 Harrison 2000: 87.

- 36 See autochthony section below, and Chapter 3 on historiographic accounts of the autochthonous Athenian kings.
- 37 Broadhead suggests that in this passage *ethnos* (56) has the sense of 'host' (1960: 47).
- 38 Saïd 2007: 78; naming individual leaders in catalogues and narratives contrasts with the anonymity of the Athenian funeral speech, as Goldhill suggests (Goldhill 1988: 192). The wholeness of Asia seems easily broken into its components, in a way that the anonymised unity of the Athenian polis is not.
- 39 Michelini 1982: 91.
- 40 Hall 1996: 24–5; Harrison 2000: 66–75; Michelini 1982: 91–5.
- 41 Michelini 1982: 92 n.48.
- 42 The unusual nature of his appearance and speech is confirmed by Hickman's survey of ghosts in classical drama (Hickman 1938: 18–31, 62); the ghostly Darius is unusual in speaking within the main action of the play, rather than the prologue or via a reported dream.
- 43 Whether Aeschylus intends to portray actual Persian religious practices has been much debated (see Hall 1989: 86–93, 1996: 15–16; Muntz 2011: 257–8). However, it is more fruitful to treat this as an investigation into cosmic monarchy, which enables Aeschylus to show similarities between Greek and Persian perspectives on the means of achieving political unity, rather than to attempt to excavate documentary evidence for Persian religious practices or broader Greek knowledge of them from the staging and text. The historical Darius is clear in the opening phrases of his documents that he holds power thanks to Ahuramazda.
- 44 Alexanderson 1967; Lockwood 2017.
- 45 See Chapter 6.
- 46 Kennedy 2013: 69–73.
- 47 Ruffy 2004 explores the play's emphasis on visualisation and display.
- 48 It is significant that Xerxes' clothes are *poikilos*, and not in themselves expressive of a simple unity. Darius' command to Atossa remains unfulfilled in the course of the play.
- 49 Bernek 2004: 15–19; Burian 1977: 4–7; Kopperschmidt 1971: 321–4; Reinhardt 1979: 197–8. On supplication in Greek religion see Gould 1973; Naiden 2006.
- 50 Loraux 1986; Parker 1987: 137–9.
- 51 Garvie 1969: 133–5; Gould 1973: 87 n.64.
- 52 Herodotus suggests (1.171.5) that the Danaids (Aeschylus' *Suppliants*) brought the Thesmophoria to Greece, so there may be an aetiological theme to that play too.
- 53 Bernek 2004: 13–14.
- 54 Mendelsohn 2002: 89.
- 55 Orestes' supplication (Aesch. *Eumenides*), managed by the goddess Athena directly, is an exception.
- 56 Burian 1974a: 9–10; Hall 2010: 207–10) points to the visual effect of the chorus of barbarian princesses.
- 57 The date has been established as 463/2 BCE from papyrus evidence (*POxy* 2256). It also explains the role of Argos, then newly allied to Athens: De Ste. Croix 1972: 180–4; Garvie 1969: 1–28; Podlecki 1966: 42–3, 1972: 69–70; Sommerstein 1997: 74–9.
- 58 Although Sommerstein reads this as 'blatant manipulation' (1997: 75), Rebecca Futo Kennedy treats the play as evidence for hardening Athenian attitudes to immigration (Kennedy 2014: 29–31).
- 59 Although the abstract noun *koinōnia* does not appear in any extant works of Aeschylus, it is used by Aristophanes in the *Thesmophoriazusae* (140) in a burlesque/parody of Aeschylus that also quotes his lost *Lycurgus* (*TrGF* 61).
- 60 Detienne and Vernant 1974; Vernant 1971, cf. Burian 1974a: 7–8, Arist. *Pol.* 3.11.1281a40–b7; see Chapter 7.
- 61 Burian 1974a: 7–8, 2011; Johansen 1970: 297. Johansen points to Pindar *Nemean* 10.6 (μυνόψαφον) where the adjective implies dissent.

- 62 Anthony Bowen suggests 'L'état, c'est toi' (Bowen 2013: 227). Kennedy 2014: 28–9 reads this as a 'subversive' critique of anti-democratic attitudes.
- 63 Vernant and Vidal-Naquet 1988: 26 argue that two different concepts of *kratos*, civic-legal and extra-legal, are in play here.
- 64 Or perhaps, the monarchical capability for generating unanimity (*homonoia*) among the population and so converting the multitude into a singular entity, that votes as one, to prioritise the *polis* over the individual.
- 65 As with Agamemnon's sceptre, created by a god and passed down through the royal line (*Iliad* 2.100–9); Carlier 1984: 190–4.
- 66 On the centrality of this myth, one of the canonical four great deeds of the Athenians, to Athens see Loraux 1981: 147–51, 217–19, Lys. 2.7–10, Plato *Menex.* 239b5–6, Hdt 9.27.3, Isoc. 4.54–5, 10.31, 12.168–71.
- 67 Mendelsohn 2002: 182–4.
- 68 Walker 1994: 146–7.
- 69 Goossens 1932: 11–20, 1962: 417–22.
- 70 Goossens 1932: 20–8; Mitchell 2008: 14–16.
- 71 Kearns 1989: 117–20, 68–9; Walker 1994: 35–66.
- 72 Ann Michelini (1994: 233–42) analyses the debate's political content.
- 73 That these Argives are Danaids is another example of connections between the suppliant plays (Bernek 2004: 308).
- 74 Michelini (1991: 21) suggests that Theseus' arguments link him to the views of Protagoras.
- 75 Carlier 1984; Schofield 1986: 3–7.
- 76 Burian 1985: 129–32.
- 77 Line 351 alludes to Aesch. *Supp.* 488, where Pelasgus advises the Danaids on how to win the citizens' favour (Podlecki 1993: 73–4). Lines 352–3 are ambiguous; both αὐτόν and πόλιν can be taken as objects of κατέστησ' and ἐλευθερώσας.
- 78 Mills 1997: 97–8.
- 79 Mills 1997: 57.
- 80 Zuntz 1963: 17.
- 81 *Ath. Pol.* 5.3, Michelini 1991: 26–7. On possible interpolation here: Collard 1975: *ad loc.*; Kovacs 1982: 34–5.
- 82 Johanna Hanink (Hanink 2014a: 341–4) argues that the performance of this play at this particular festival enabled Athenians to look backwards as well as forwards.
- 83 Ahrensdoerf 2009: 73–82; Knox 1964, 1982; Vernant and Vidal-Naquet 1988: 342–54; J.P. Wilson 1997.
- 84 While tyranny often represents oligarchy in Athenian drama and texts, the youthful arrogance of this potential tyrant clearly links him to oligarchic faction (R. Osborne 2003: 268–70).
- 85 E.g. Xenophon *Hellenica* 2.3–4 (depicting events contemporary with the writing of the *OC*), Pl. *Rep.* books 8–9.
- 86 Blundell 1993.
- 87 Markantonatos 2007: 35–9. Xenophon *Hellenica* 1.6–7, Aristophanes *Frogs* (cf. references to Sophocles' recent death, 75–9, 786–9). Cf. Shear 2011: 14–18.
- 88 Cf. Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* (387–423); Henderson 1990: 117–18.
- 89 Edmunds 1996: 100–12; Kearns 1989: 208–9. Cf. Aeschylus *Eleusinioi*, also set in the playwright's home deme.
- 90 Cf. Aristophanes *Knights* with its chorus of cavalrymen (*hippeis*); Hornblower 1991–2008: 3.949–50; Parker 2007: 57, 389.
- 91 Edmunds 1996: 91–2.
- 92 Vernant and Vidal-Naquet 1988: 357–9.
- 93 See also the theme of the ignorance and poor decision-making of the Athenian masses in Thucydides (e.g. 6.24).

- 94 Burian 1974b: 410–12.
- 95 Blundell 1991: 226–32.
- 96 J.P. Wilson 1997: 29–62.
- 97 Markantonatos 2007: 130–1.
- 98 *Archon basileus* as public official in charge of older ceremonies at Athens: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 3.2–5, Rhodes 1993: 99–106.
- 99 Blundell 1993; Easterling 1997.
- 100 Loraux 1993b: 38–9.
- 101 Non-Athenian autochthons (Rosivach 1987: 297–8): Herodotus (Carians 1.171–2; Libyans and Ethiopians 4.197.2, Arcadians and Cynourians 8.73), Pausanias (Aras of Phliasia (Phlius), 2.12.4). Later claims to autochthony: Pelling 2009: 474–5.
- 102 Calame 2011: 3–4; Connelly 1996: 55; Mikalson 1976.
- 103 Aeschylus' Pelasgus is also an Athenian autochthon; see Aesch. *Supp.* 250–251; Hdt 1.56–8, Thuc. 2.17, cf. Pelling 2009: 480–1.
- 104 Although further lost/fragmentary plays may have explored Athenian themes, Athenian themes may also be over-represented in the survivals (Collard and Cropp 2008: xxi–xxiii).
- 105 Rosivach 1987: 300–4.
- 106 Loraux 1993b: vii–ix, 48. Vases listed by Loraux include a red-figure *lekkythos* (Paris, Louvre, CA 681), a red-figure *hydria* (475–450 BCE, British Museum E182) and a red-figure *stamnos* (475–450 BCE, Munich Antikensammlungen 2413).
- 107 Loraux 1993b: 59; Zuntz 1963: 120–2.
- 108 Athenians collectively as Erechtheids in tragedy: Sophocles *Aj.* 202, *Ant.* 982; Euripides *Heracles* 1166, *Medea* 824–5, *Ion* 24, 1056, 1060, *Supp.* 387, 681, 702, *Phoen.* 852. Parker 1987: 194–5.
- 109 In contrast, the chorus of *Wasps* identify themselves as autochthonous Athenians, asserting their collective identity and unique capabilities (1076–7).
- 110 Detienne and Jones 2001: 53–5; Vian 1963.
- 111 Hes. *Th.* 185–6.
- 112 Cf. Plato's *Statesman* myth; see Chapter 6.
- 113 Parker 1987: 202–3.
- 114 Calame 2011: 5–8.
- 115 Mitchell 2007: 89–90; O'Connor-Visser 1987. Sophocles' Jocasta is clear that her desires, and those of the city, are different (*OT* 850).
- 116 Goossens 1962: 473.
- 117 If these lines are not interpolations, as Kovacs argues (Kovacs 1982, 1998: 57), Euripides' characters represent an early instance of the fourth-century theme of virtue monarchy (see Chapter 5). Similar views expressed by Theseus (such as *Supp.* 452–5) are often identified as later interpolations.
- 118 Carrière 1997: 414–17.
- 119 Dobrov 1990.
- 120 Bowie 1993: 159; Ruffell 2000: 474–86; Storey 2003: 269–73; most explicitly in Eupolis' *Chrysoun Genos*.
- 121 Bowie 1993: 58–66; Hofmann 1976: 83. Bowie analyses the *Knights* as a Hesiodic succession myth, but does not pursue structural parallels within *Birds*.
- 122 Davie 1979: 164–8 correctly notes Aristophanes' interest in monarchy but draws the erroneous conclusion that he favoured it as a constitutional form.
- 123 Hes. *Th.* 81–92; Stoddard 2003
- 124 Zeus as *basileus*: *Clouds* 2, 153; *Wasps* 624, *Birds* 223, *Frogs* 1278, *Wealth* 1095: the Clouds as *pambaseileiai*, *Clouds* 357: other gods as *anax*: Apollo (*Birds* 80); Heracles (*Peace* 180; *Lysistrata* 296, *Acharnians* 94, *Frogs* 298); Poseidon (*Knights* 551). Cf. Introduction on Hesiod's use of kingship language.
- 125 MacDowell 1971 *ad loc* finds authoritarian overtones in the reference to thunder (671, and *Acharnians* 531).

- 126 Anderson and Dix 2006: 321–3. Zeus as *turannos*: *Birds* 1605, 1643, ps-Aesch. *PV* 324. S.D. Olson 2007: 207–8 argues that *turannos* is a neutral term when applied to Zeus, though not when applied to human politicians; Raaflaub 2003: 72–3 disputes that fifth-century Athenians had any positive assessment of tyranny, as argued by Connor 1977.
- 127 Aristophanes occasionally explores contemporary kingship, notably in the *Acharnians* where the different systems of Spartan and Persian kingship are discussed within the context of the Peloponnesian War (*Acharnians* 61–5, 113, 486). Foley 1988.
- 128 Bakola 2010: 180–229; S.D. Olson 2007: 187–226.
- 129 Vickers 1995.
- 130 Cartledge 1990; De Ste. Croix 1972: 355–76; Gomme 1938; Sidwell 2009: 299–302.
- 131 Slater 1996: 33–4 compares Aristophanes’ private court in *Wasps* to Robert Nozick’s ‘experience machine’ (Nozick 1974: 42–3) and virtual reality experiments.
- 132 Ruffell 2000.
- 133 Carrière 2004: 67–8; Konstan 1985: 30–3; Olson 1996: 145–9.
- 134 Hutchinson 2011: 62–7.
- 135 Dover 1972: 125–7.
- 136 Biles and Olson 2015 *ad loc.*
- 137 L.B. Carter 1986; Demont 1990.
- 138 Whitman 1964: 143–66. Attempts have been made to read Aristophanes’ father–son pairs as a comment on Pericles and his ward Alcibiades (Vickers 2008), cf Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.40–6.
- 139 Davie 1979: 166.
- 140 Philocleon’s claim may be absurd because, when acting as a juror, he is one of a collective of Athenian citizens, without a monarch’s individual power. But his claim underscores the tension between individual and collective.
- 141 Bakola 2010: 223; Carrière 1979: 210, 30–1; *Chirones* Fr K-A 258.
- 142 Biles and Olson 2015: li.
- 143 The same objection to a gesture which physically performs inequality is expressed at *Birds* 499–501 when Peisetaurus describes the Athenians prostrating themselves (*proskulindeisthai*, 501) to the kites, a gesture acknowledging the return of spring (Dunbar 1995: 343–4).
- 144 Slater 1996: 35–6 queries whether this is explicit.
- 145 Carrière 2004: 84–8.
- 146 Carrière 1979: 121.
- 147 Carrière 2004: 77–8.
- 148 Goldhill 1991: 182–4.
- 149 Bakola 2010: 162, 213; Konstan 1990: 189–201; Ruffell 2000: 474–86. A partial list of comedies whose utopian explorations are confirmed by fragments and testimonia (Cratinus: *Chirones* (440s–429 BCE) *Ploutoi* (429), *Seriphioi* (423–422); Eupolis *Demoi* (426?), in which Athens’ past leaders send great politicians back to the city (Storey 2003: 112–16).
- 150 Plato: Kallipolis (*Republic*), Magnesia (*Laws*); Aristotle: *Politics* VII–VIII; lost *polit-eiai*; *Politics* II; Greek utopian writing: Dawson 1992; Hansen 2005.
- 151 Sommerstein 1987: 1–2; Whitman 1964: 167. Just like *Ecclesiazusae* (Dawson 1992: 37–40; Hutchinson 2011: 59–61; Rothwell 1990: 10–19) cf. Adam 1963: 345–55 on the resemblances between Praxagora’s city and Plato’s.
- 152 Dover 1972: 145–6; Henderson 1997: 142.
- 153 Dobrov 1997; Konstan 1990; Pozzi 1991.
- 154 See previous chapter for Herodotus on oikists and ideal kings.
- 155 Hodgkinson 2005 etc.
- 156 Slater 1997: 87.
- 157 Henderson 1997: 137–8; Whitman 1964: 170.

- 158 Seen in *patrios politeia* arguments (e.g. Isocrates *Areopagiticus*, Plato *Menexenus*); Atack 2010.
- 159 Tereus in myth is a former barbarian king (though linked to Athens through his marriage to Procne). Henderson reads the Tereus character here as a representation of Nicias' political ineffectuality, compared with the dynamism of Alcibiades, represented by Peisetairos (Henderson 1997: 137–8). Others suggest that Tereus' presence is a warning of the gruesome dangers of tyranny (Bowie 1993: 166–9; Zannini Quirini 1987: 25–39).
- 160 Heath 1997: 231.
- 161 See the essays in Dobrov 2007.
- 162 Anderson and Dix 2006; Bowie 1993: 164–6; Sommerstein 1987: 298. The question of Basileia's identity is posed directly in the play (1537), and the answer that is given refers directly back to Athens (1537–41); Basileia is the steward of all Zeus' qualities and powers, including the thunderbolt, and represents positive abstract qualities of government; but she also manages also features of imperial Athens – dockyards, jury pay, flattery and abuse. Athenians would link the name to the Basilinna, wife of the Athenian *basileus archon*, ritually married to Dionysus in the annual Anthesteria festival; Dunbar 1995: 703–4; Sommerstein 1987; cf. [Arist] *Ath Pol* 3.5, Parker 2007: 303–5. Basileia as a goddess: Bowie 1993: 163; Hofmann 1976: 147–58; Holzhausen 2002: 43–5.
- 163 P.Oxy 663 (*CGFP* 70) i.14–19. Bakola 2010: 289–94; Bowie 2000: 324–5; cf. Pherecrates *Tyrannis*, (KA 150–4).

3 The discourse of kingship in classical Athenian thought

Plutarch, looking back at the history of classical Athens from the end of the first century CE from his home in the Boeotian city of Chaeronea, claimed that the Athenians were unable to tell stories about their past without invoking their culture-hero Theseus, indeed that they inserted him into many famous stories, to the extent that ‘Not without Theseus’ became a proverb (*Theseus* 29.3). These stories became elaborate and detailed; the earlier Athenian historian Kleidemos described the battle in which Theseus fought the Amazons and its locations within the city from the Pnyx to the shrine of the Eumenides (*Theseus* 27.4), and also the complex diplomatic manoeuvres which preceded Theseus’ voyage to Crete, in which he rescued the Athenian hostages at the gate of the labyrinth (19.4–6).¹ Plutarch expresses some scepticism about the level of detail in these versions of the story, based on contradictory versions he also reports. He describes Kleidemos’ Cretan story as ‘peculiar and excessive (περιττωδες)’ and his Amazons story as expressing a wish ‘to give a precise account (ἐξακριβοῦν)’ of everything. Plutarch also exploits differences between local historians’ stories.

Kleidemos’ history of Athens, of which Plutarch’s critique is our best evidence, exemplifies the use of Athenian foundation stories as political exemplars in a new genre of local history that extended from the distant past to the present. The traditional stories about Theseus and other kings, familiar from tragedy, gained a political edge as they were incorporated into the city’s political history and connected to its more recent political history. Writers in this emerging genre concatenated multiple local stories into single unified chronologies. But many of these stories were also used by educators and orators, who presented them as improving exempla; Theseus becomes a model for ambitious politicians to imitate.

Political and military developments in the Greek world outside Athens also focused attention on kingship. Throughout the fourth century monarchical regimes such as that of Macedon became more successful and challenged Athenian hegemony. The emergence of new written prose genres occasioned new treatment of the city’s past and significant changes in the handling of kingship stories.² Historiography sought to map a unified story of the city’s history into its deepest past, while educational and rhetorical texts might find individual stories more useful as exemplars of excellent behaviour for ambitious young citizens to imitate. While Theseus, the *ephebe* who saved the city, and later as king united it, was the

predominant mythical figure, central to Athenian cult and festivals, further figures could be exploited at different times for different purposes, including Erechtheus for defending the city and Codrus for individual bravery. These texts drew on the drama and historiography examined in the previous chapters. They demonstrate their writers' engagement with and in some cases politicisation of the city's collective mythical imaginary. None of the thinkers surveyed in this chapter had any explicit commitment to monarchy as a practical form of constitution for the democratic Athens of their time. But kings provided useful exempla when invoking past greatness, or comparing the democratic polis with other political entities such as the monarchical *ethnos* state of Macedon.

Kleidemos had produced a local history to a pattern that would be copied around the Greek world (the Athenian versions are known as *Atticides*).³ These histories probably took the form of annals or chronologies, and began with the first kings and founders in the pre-historic past, working through lists of kings before moving on to the more recent past and contemporary history.⁴ The relationship between the *Atticides* and Athenian political life and theory has been much disputed; the few surviving fragments make it impossible to determine fully their format, presentation and relation to surviving literary political histories such as that of Thucydides. Felix Jacoby's developmental model of Greek historiography, with its separate genres based on spatial focus, obscured rather than explicated their specific features and the politically significant conflation of the genres of historiography and mythography; while history and myth are not separate categories of knowledge for these authors, retelling stories within a historical structure and the generic constraints and demands of history.⁵ Some scholars continue to argue that the texts are largely antiquarian miscellanies with little political content. But the positioning of foundation myths on a calculable time scale, and the continuing assimilation of deeds of figures like Theseus to those of contemporary political leaders, suggest a changing approach to the past similar to that exploited in political rhetoric and argument.⁶

The political import of kingship stories becomes clearer in rhetorical texts of the fourth century BCE. Isocrates, Lycurgus and others could cite the Athenian heritage of kingship to position their democratic city as equivalent or superior to rising *ethnos* state monarchies such as Macedon, and use kingship myths for novel political and propaganda purposes, drawing on both tragic and historical accounts of the city's distant past, and collapsing distinctions between past and present. Their texts show how the ideal of the king as super-citizen and holder of a superior understanding of the polis, inherited from Euripidean tragedy, could be used in contemporary debate and to analyse the actions and motivations of kings such as Philip of Macedon. Where Euripides' Theseus appeared to exemplify the *demos*, orators and philosophers now presented kings as examples for citizens to imitate, rather than those of the collective heroised citizenry of earlier democratic rhetoric.⁷ Kings also provided patterns for their own educational practice and desire to benefit the city. The use of mythical deeds to position Athens as superior to states with greater political or military power in the present is a signature move of Isocrates' political argumentation, seen in his *Panegyricus* 21–27, 99 (Athenian

superiority to Sparta), and *To Philip* 128–31 (Athens as an equal ally for Macedon). Other orators make less use of kingship stories; Aeschines' reference to the sons of Theseus, justifying the Athenian claim to Amphipolis, is a rare example (*On the Embassy* 31). Apollodorus retells the history of Athenian monarchy ([Dem.] 59.74–6) to establish the religious significance of the *archon basileus*, who carried out religious ceremonies thought to have originated with the kings.⁸ But Isocrates and Lycurgus develop the use of the kings as exemplars in a way that does not always align with their appearances in the local historical texts.

By examining the way in which Theseus and other Athenian kings were used in fourth-century historiography and rhetoric, this chapter aims to show that even in the context of a mature democracy the idea of the king still did important work in constructing Athenian political identity.

Structuring the Athenian past in time and space

As well as complaining about the dubious details of the accounts of the distant past that provides sources for his life of Theseus, Plutarch suggested that in his version 'the fabulous (τὸ μυθώδες) would be cleaned up (ἐκκαθαίρομενον) and yield to reason (λόγῳ) and take on the appearance of history (ιστορίας)', while acknowledging that his 'ancient tale' (ἀρχαιολογίαν) might lack credibility (1.3). He drew a clear distinction between the practices of historiography and those of poetry and mythography here, comparing them to knowledge of one's local area or very distant places.⁹

The authors on whom Plutarch drew also identified these problems. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing in the first century BCE, describes earlier historians as organising their work either by time, *kata chronous*, or by space, *kata topous*. He places Herodotus and Hellanicus within the latter category.¹⁰ His distinction refers to the use of geography or the regional homes of tribes (*ethnos*) to organise the components of large-scale, multiregime *logoi*, such as Herodotus' Egyptian *logos* within his *Histories*, or Hellanicus' works on Egypt, Persia and other locations. But the same process also applied on a local scale. Local historians had an obvious focus on their specific locale, but needed to integrate stories from separate pre-synoeism communities into a single narrative structure. Founders and kings played specific roles in such stories.

For Herodotus, Athenian foundation stories were a matter of largely topographical interest, explaining the mythical heritage of various locations; suggesting that the sources familiar to him were not arranged as chronologically sequenced histories but related to specific locations. His interest is in the collective Athenians as political actors (8.44.2); individual kings are rarely named as actors (the account of Theseus' abduction of Helen at 9.73.2, explaining the Spartan relationship with Decelea, is an exception to this).¹¹ His most prominent discussion of Athenian kings accompanies the description of specific cult sites around the Acropolis (8.52–5).¹² These passages are driven by topographical concerns, although for democratic Athenians the organisation of space was explicitly politicised.¹³ Only at 5.76 does Herodotus use a king to establish a synchronism, when he places the

first Spartan invasion of Attica in the time of Codrus; this was an important transition point for Athenian history in other ways.¹⁴

How to talk and write about the past were contested issues in Athenian intellectual culture, with a trend towards historicisation and rationalisation, as a large body of disparate stories was unified and historicised through developments such as the ordered chronology of the king list, which provided a structure for reaching into the distant past and ordering events that took place within it. Historians also developed literary forms capable of encompassing great distances in space within single narrative structures, such as the universal history that connected the stories of the Mediterranean world.¹⁵ Both these trends had implications for the development of historical narrative and its use in political discourse, within which claims to both time and space are contested. Both space and time required some thought in weaving the many different traditions of Athenian myth into a single coherent narrative. Source material for these myths originated in the scattered locations of different cult sites around pre-synoecism Attica, and Athenian myth itself required a process of unification to match that of the city itself.¹⁶ This unification of spatial and temporal systems within a single all-encompassing structure is at least in part a historiographical manifestation of the metaphysics of monarchy, with founders and synoecists presiding over periods of political construction. In this sense, Plutarch's proverb is telling, and the unificatory structures of the Atthidographers inherently politicised.

In this way, in the fourth century the manipulation of civic myth by earlier Athenian dramatists was replaced by the manipulation of an accessible and narratable past, connected to the present by unbroken lists of office-holders. The 'intentional history' (*intentionale Geschichte*) model, as elaborated by Hans-Joachim Gehrke, offers an explanation for the shape that Greek local histories took, as their authors (consciously or otherwise) interpreted their mythical sources through the lens of their own political situation and to further their own political claims and objectives.¹⁷ Conceptual divisions between the near and distant past, and the differing knowledge of each, had generated different styles of historical narration, with the return of the Heraclids to the Peloponnese after the Trojan War offering a point at which more detailed historical narrative became possible and irrational or fantastic elements less easy to integrate. Ephorus, for example, started his universal history at this point, and framed the earlier period as a preface.¹⁸ Local historians such as Athens' Atthidographers, however, disregarded these divisions in presenting the past of a city in its entirety, and the nature of their narrative must have necessarily changed as the more recent past was reached and more information could be obtained through research. Writers' specific agendas might affect the amount of detail in their coverage of different periods.¹⁹

The transformation of the separate foundation stories involving kings, and the political archon list, into a single timeline enabled the development of a unitary history of Athens from its foundations. The archon list the 'floating gap' between the near past and that which had slipped out of living memory, that was observed by so-called 'great' historians with their focus on contemporary history that could be told from the oral evidence of living sources.²⁰ Then the king list, preceding it,

took history back beyond the accepted limit for historical narration of the Heraclids, and thus to the time of Theseus; while the Greeks themselves did not fully distinguish between myth and history, some elements of kingship stories, particularly interactions with gods and mythical beasts, were less easily accommodated within historical narrative. But Theseus appears to gain the status he needs to perform the actions of a cosmic king, which synoecism would seem to be, through his heroic deeds and encounters with fabulous beasts such as the Minotaur.

This development enabled the fourth- and third-century Attidographers to retell the stories of Athens' mythical monarchs as stories of exemplary political and military leaders, as if they were contemporary leading citizens, or rather, highly superior alternatives to them. But the story of most importance for Athenian politics, the story of Theseus' synoecism of Attica, was not dependent on fabulous elements.

The construction of chronologies through lists of office-holders was a development of the late fifth century, closely associated with the development of local historiography.²¹ The *Attides* were the fruit of this new way of structuring the past, using these developments to embed the mythical monarchs in the chronology of Athenian history. As Peter Rhodes notes, their accounts of the early past of Athens 'put together and systematise' previously separate foundation and origin myths.²² Written from the late fifth century into the third century BCE, they span a period of immense political change in the city and the wider Greek world, in which monarchy itself came to greater prominence.

Hellanicus' postulated work on the Athenian king-list was in step with other intellectual and political developments.²³ Lists were emerging as a means of constructing chronologies which reached back into the distant past and permitted the generation of synchronisms. Sophists such as Hippias of Elis collated lists of games victors; Hellanicus himself collated a list of priestesses of Hera at Argos, enabling the development of dating mechanisms and synchronism across the Greek world.²⁴ Sparta and Macedon already had king lists in the form of the royal pedigrees reported by Herodotus.²⁵ Hellanicus' probable innovation was to preface Athens' (partly) historical archon list, whose epigraphic publication dates to the 420s, with a king list, creating a structure with no differentiation beyond the changes of types of rule. It created the conditions in which the distinction between the narration of recent and distant history, a distinction important to Greek contemporary historians such as Thucydides, could be collapsed; von Leyden's distinction between the *spatium mythicum* and *spatium historicum* is challenged by the role of figures from the distant past in foundation narratives, who simultaneously inhabit both spaces, and both chronological and genealogical time.²⁶

For the Attidographers, the construction of a single linear sequence created some joins between existing sequences of rulers which then needed explanation. This is where the genealogical approach meets a need for more precise timing; the genealogical approach of mythographers such as Pherecydes (*FGrH* 3) is augmented by a more precise approach to accounting for the passage of past time, and the use of historical explanation of change.²⁷ The Attidographers' interest in changes of royal dynasty, such as that from the Erechtheid to the Medontid

dynasty, apparent from the fragments (such as Hellanicus F23, with its suggestion that there are divergent accounts of the events told) may therefore provide evidence of multiple separate kingship stories being collated into a linear sequence.²⁸ Atthidography contains several episodes of political change, but it is not clear whether this integrates changes that were already part of the source myth, or represents the stitching together in linear time of events from the timeless ages of myth, which then requires historical explanations to be found for changes in dynasty.

This process of narrating the stories of kings generated problems of chronology when emplotted in a single sequence in historical time. A hero existing in mythical time can undertake many exploits without any need for them all to be in a plausible or fixed linear sequence. Nor do his exploits necessarily require detailed synchronisation with other mythical sequences, even where characters interact. Fitting Athenian myth to the other mythical cycles, of the deeds of Heracles and the Trojan War, required a certain amount of finessing on the part of the Atthidographers to align the generations of separate stories. One solution was the cloning of kings to fill temporal gaps in the Athenian king-lists, seen in the appearance of a Pandion I and Pandion II in chronologies reported by the first-century BCE historian Castor of Rhodes, and in the second-century BCE epigraphic chronography *Marmor Parium*. Such innovations supported the construction of a linear account of Athens' past.²⁹

Historians may have responded to demand from patriotic citizens in creating these stories; Plato shows the Spartans demanding ancient history and genealogies from Hippias.³⁰ Hellanicus was probably writing during the 420s, as the city's dramatists turned to patriotic Athenian myth in the context of the Peloponnesian War, and his cataloguing of the same stories might echo the dramatists' interest in them and motives for presenting them to the public.³¹ Testimony from lexicographers and scholiasts, commentators on ancient texts from later antiquity, supports the view that mythographers and dramatists shared these interests: for example, both a Euripidean text and Hellanicus are cited together as sources for obscure figures of Athenian myth, such as Alopē, daughter of Kerkyon.³² Ancient biographical tradition also groups Hellanicus with Euripides and Sophocles as visitors to the Macedonian court.³³ While these traditions may be fictional, the grouping of writers and the implied assessment of their views has some significance, and the same political situation that inspired Athens' dramatists to use kingship stories to explore Athens' situation may have accounted for the desire to retell its ancient stories in that context. The Atthidographers' focus may be an instance of the 'invention of tradition', parallel to those of nineteenth-century imperial Britain examined by Hobsbawm and Ranger.³⁴

How the transition from monarchy to leadership by non-royal archons took place remains unclear in surviving evidence from their accounts. For Isocrates, monarchy ended with Theseus' foundation of Athenian democracy, but that conflicts with the evidence of the king list, and fragments from the Atthidographers.³⁵ These texts suggest a transitional period in Athens, in which monarchs who succeeded Theseus ruled badly (other than the exemplary Codrus), and were replaced by archons, ruling for life, then for 10-year periods, and finally the annual

archonship of the classical city.³⁶ Heraclides' epitome of the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* (Heraclid. *Pol.* 1) tells a story from this transitional period, criticising the misdeeds of the archon Hippomenes (said to have held the archonship between 723–713 BCE), and contains many elements found in other accounts of tyranny.³⁷ Athenian history does not attribute good rule or exemplary status to kings or archons after Codrus; many are simply entries on list, with no stories attached to them.

The Athenian past in rhetoric and philosophy

The works of Thucydides, Isocrates and Plato provide evidence for the continuing use of Athenian kingship stories in the historical writing of the late fifth and fourth centuries. Two passages from Thucydides elaborate the distinction between the focus on a rationalised past and the knowable near-present. Pericles' funeral speech (2.37–46) explicitly omits the traditional great deeds of the ancient Athenians, declining 'to speak at length (μακρηγορεῖν) about familiar things' (2.36.4), unlike Lysias who stressed their educational value (Lys. 2.3–16). These deeds might have been expected to feature as they do in other literary funeral speeches, but Thucydides' methodology is firmly focused on contemporary history; in his preface he rejects the possibility of detailed knowledge of 'the even more distant past' (τὰ ἔτι παλαιότερα, 1.1.3). In contrast, when the Athenian general Nicias addresses his beleaguered expeditionary force in Sicily (7.69.2), he speaks to each man of his tribe and ancestors and rehearses their famous deeds, 'without guarding against speaking in an old-fashioned way (ἀρχαιολογεῖν)'. The verb *archaiologeîn* has been translated as 'talk of ancient history', a meaning that its cognate noun *archaiologia* certainly bears in Hellenistic times and later, but here it seems to mean 'talk in an old-fashioned manner'.³⁸

Thucydides had already set out his objection to the use and exploration of the ancient past and mythical material in his introduction, emphasising that it was impossible to learn about the distant past (1.1.3, 1.20.1), and that he would exclude mythical material from his narration (1.22.4), a promise which his prehistory delivers in telling of Athens' rise through thalassocracy rather than the story of Theseus.³⁹ By depicting Nicias deploying this mode of rhetoric on this occasion, he seems to suggest that that to speak in such an old-fashioned manner is to deploy a last resort in a desperate situation.

Isocrates' introduction to his *Panegyricus*, which positions Athens as the city that should lead a Panhellenic force against Persia, confirms that there was a political edge to the handling of historical material. He contrasts ways of talking about ancient things: one can achieve novelty and interest 'by speaking of ancient events (*ta palaia*) in a new way (*kainōs*), and about the most recent events (*tōn neōsti gegenēmenōn*) in an old-fashioned way (*archaiōs*)' (τὰ τε παλαιὰ καινῶς διελεθῆναι καὶ περὶ τῶν νεωστὶ γεγεννημένων ἀρχαίως εἰπεῖν, *Paneg.* 8).⁴⁰ He goes on to add that 'the deeds of the past are an inheritance common to all of us' (*Paneg.* 9); but handling this shared material enables individuals to demonstrate their skill.⁴¹ Isocrates himself exemplifies this practice, using the familiar Athenian story of

city's aid to the returning Heraclids to argue that Athens remained superior to Sparta in the contemporary world, and indeed that Sparta would always retain its dependence on Athens narrated in this myth. The contrast between status derived from myth and status derived from recent events is particularly acute in the *Panegyricus*.⁴²

How to narrate ancient events in relation to the key value of accuracy (*akribeia*) became an established topos of methodological statements in fourth-century historiography; Ephorus, possibly a student of Isocrates, argues that different modes of narration are appropriate to the distant and recent past, on account of the lack of precision possible in narrating the distant past: 'we consider to be most credible the people speaking with the most detail about the events which have happened in our own time, and we think that those who relate ancient events in the same way are the most untrustworthy'.⁴³

Isocrates subverts this historiographical concern by asserting the priority of the distant past over the recent past, mythical strengths over recent failures. He likes to toy with the relative status of ancient myth and recent history; in the *Evagoras*, for example, he contrasts the status of Trojan War heroes with that of Evagoras of Salamis, who has opposed all of Asia on his own (5–6, 65–9).⁴⁴ It is also evident in Isocrates' use of *patrios politeia* arguments, as at *Areopagiticus* 16–18, where the ancient is exemplified by pre-Marathon Athens, the recent by contemporary politics.⁴⁵

Plato regards history as a poor source of educational exemplars, and particularly as a basis for political theory; it provides only negative exemplars of decline, as in the examination of the Dorian League, Athens and Persia in *Laws* III, and the parody of rhetorical history in the funeral speech of the *Menexenus*.⁴⁶ The *Hippias Maior* identifies ancient history as a poor-quality topic, suitable only for use with unintelligent audiences, and resembling the stories that old women 'gladly tell' children (*Hp. Mai.* 286a1–2).⁴⁷ Hippias explains to Socrates that in Sparta, where his intellectualised form of sophistic education, including mathematics and harmonics, is forbidden, he is compelled to give talks on the ancestry of heroes and men, the foundation of cities, and in general ancient history (*ἀρχαιολογίας*, 285d8), precisely the topics of Atthidography (285d6–e2).⁴⁸ The Spartans wrong-foot the celebrity sophist by forcing him to engage in this unpalatable discourse of antiquity.

The theme of monarchy connects the political, topographical and cultic interests of the Atthidographers with significant changes in the cultural context of the Athenian democracy, evident from the use of these transformed accounts in various other genres from the Aristotelian *politeia* to the political rhetoric of Isocrates and Lycurgus.⁴⁹ The past form of the city's constitution, and the characters of its past leaders, whether kings, aristocrats or democratic leaders, are increasingly used as exemplars by rhetoricians. This process parallels the increasingly didactic nature of 'great' history, with its similar emphasis on the character of leaders, such as Xenophon's *Hellenica*.⁵⁰

But the development of this prehistory of early Athens was itself a politicised act, which provided an alternative account of the origins of the democratic *politeia*,

one that presented it as the gift of a monarch to the community, rather than the product of popular and collaborative effort, as in the model posited by Ober.⁵¹ While the *Atthis* is not a *politeia*, the separation between the two genres is far from complete, and more a question of focus.⁵²

The focus on Theseus

As the previous chapter's account of Theseus in Athenian drama showed, the Athenian culture hero was regarded as refounding the city by uniting it through synoecism. The process of civic unification is the exemplary act of the cosmic king, but in the Athenian context it was sometimes seen as the precursor to the establishment of democracy. Theseus' story had long been incorporated into Athenian political iconography, notably by Cimon in the 460s, although the goals and motivations for invoking Theseus varied over time.⁵³ Narratives were recast for political edge by some historians, but also developed through literary processes of amplification, as they accreted details, as in Kleidemos' account of the Amazonomachy.

Thucydides' account of the story is an unusual intrusion of Athenian foundation myth into his historico-political narrative. It identifies Theseus as an important agent in Athenian political history, and one who is presented to make an explicit contrast with contemporary politics (2.15.2). Athens' foundation by Cecrops and synoecism by Theseus are retold as part of an elaborate comparison between these acts and Pericles' gathering of the citizens within Athens during the war (2.15.1).⁵⁴ The linkage between Pericles and Theseus is ambiguous, but Theseus is portrayed positively, not, as Henry Walker suggests, as an oriental despot; he acts 'with intelligence' (μετὰ τοῦ ξυνητοῦ), and the language is the positive language of unification and 'setting in order' (διεκόσμησε), the prime act of the cosmic king.⁵⁵

From the fragments it is clear that the Atthidographers included many details from Theseus' career that were difficult to integrate into a unified linear narrative of Athenian history, or which presented jarring aspects of the fabulous. Philochorus and Demon, for example, turned the story of the Cretan expedition into a more typical military narrative, in which the minotaur becomes a Cretan general called Tauros, who served King Minos ('named Tauros', Philochorus F17a; 'Taurus, they say, was chosen as a general of Minos', Demon F5).⁵⁶ The mythical hero and his fantastical opponents are rationalised in a way that enables them to be fitted into a continuous historical chronology without admitting the marvellous to the historical sphere.⁵⁷ The rewriting of Theseus' campaign to Crete as if he were a contemporary general makes it possible to place him in a human, linear chronology that does not require him to be operating in a mythical space where non-rational events and creatures are unproblematic.

This process also normalises the presence of monarchs within the Athenian tradition. Where democratic generals were the protagonists of contemporary histories, mythical kings provided exemplary leadership in the *Atthides*. One might note the Athenians' disaffection with their military leadership that is a feature of the first half of the fourth century; even for successful leaders, there were frequent

eisangelia trials, in which generals were brought to court over their military record.⁵⁸ Theseus was, at least for some time, immune to such criticism.

The traditions about the end of Theseus' rule suggest some of the contradictions within his story, and the differing motives of those who told them. A king who gives up his kingship in favour of the democratic mob could hardly be a good exemplar for conservative anti-democrats, as a slightly later text, the *Characters* of Theophrastus, makes clear. His 'Oligarchic Man' criticises Theseus for the political consequences of synoecism, the increase in the power of the *demos*: 'in consolidating from twelve cities to one he increased (αὐξῆσαι) the people' (*Characters* 26.6–7), a change which led to his loss of power.⁵⁹ The Oligarchic Man sees Theseus as a victim of the democracy he had enabled, but other accounts, including Isocrates and the *Marmor Parium*, depict Theseus as 'handing over' rule (παρέδωκε, *MP* 20) to the democracy (the *MP* gives a date for this equivalent to 1259–1258 BCE, 50 years before the fall of Troy), although Isocrates and Apollodorus both see Theseus as having maintained power in a structure like that depicted in Euripides' *Suppliants* ([Dem] 59.75).

Isocrates' Theseus

Isocrates' use of Theseus as an exemplar is unusual in surviving works; Lycurgus' use of Athenian kings is a rare comparator. But it offers an insight into the way in which kingship continued to have a special significance. Isocrates' works can be read within the changing context of Athenian political discourse; he claims to be almost 98 years old as he completes the *Panathenaicus*, and is said to have died soon after the Athenian defeat at Chaeronea in 338.⁶⁰ His extant works provide insights into changes in political discourse over the preceding 50 years, although his political works (as opposed to logographic works) cluster into periods of political activity in his later career.⁶¹ When Isocrates revisits topics from earlier speeches in later ones, he does so self-consciously (*Panathenaicus* 126–7). Athenian monarchy as represented by Theseus is one of these topics, appearing in both the early *Helen* and the late *Panathenaicus*.

Attempts to produce a developmental model to explain changes in Isocrates' political thought are beset with difficulties. The construction of his speeches with internally opposed arguments, the adoption of the personae of different speakers, the engagement with different literary genres, all make it harder to assert that a viewpoint expressed in a speech reflects a specific staging post in the development of his thought. This has led some critics to deny that he is politically engaged at all, but simply engaging in rhetorical exercises, in which different perspectives are allocated to speakers including himself; for others, the construction of his own identity is the primary interest.⁶² But the context of the competition to educate Athens' elite for political leadership necessarily involves Isocrates in consideration of the city's politics and the stories which a speaker might use to support winning arguments.⁶³

As a writer engaged in the critique of Athenian identity, Isocrates might be expected to make use of Athenian myth, and does so extensively.⁶⁴ Athenian myth

is transformed into political argument in many of his works, buttressed by methodological concern about how to make use of myth and mythical prehistory in argument. Argument and exemplarity are Isocrates' concerns, rather than historical enquiry.⁶⁵

Theseus appears as an important example in two very different works, first in Isocrates' encomium to Helen (*Helen* 18–37), and later in the *Panathenaicus* (127–9). Isocrates expresses concern about the repeated use of the same example, part of the theme of repetition, age and novelty that permeates the *Panathenaicus*, but there are subtle and important shifts in the signification of Theseus myth in the later work compared with the earlier one.

Existing interpretations of the *Helen* fail to interpret the political content of the work with sufficient clarity, giving insufficient weight to the use of Theseus as part of a political argument in which the superiority of Athens over other cities and Isocrates over other educators within Athens will be asserted. While the external, Panhellenic aspect of Isocrates' political discourse has been carefully analysed, less attention has been given to his Theseus discourse within its Athenian political context.⁶⁶ But reading the Theseus digression in the context of the *Panegyricus*, another speech from the earlier part of Isocrates' career, shows that it amplifies the political use of Theseus.

The *Helen* is a complex work with multiple purposes; its unifying principle has proven elusive.⁶⁷ At one level Isocrates is engaged in debate with the sophistic tradition of Helen as a paradoxical example of a virtuous woman wrongly maligned, producing an epideictic display as a critique of Gorgias' encomium of Helen (14–15).⁶⁸ But just as in Plato, dialogic encounters with fifth-century sophists in Isocrates can represent contemporary fourth-century encounters with a newer generation; Isocrates is also offering more than a critique of his predecessors, as he makes explicit (2–5). Educators need to demonstrate their usefulness, as some do not (οὐδὲν μὲν ὠφελοῦσας, 1), just as Theseus' deeds will turn out to be 'more useful' than those of Heracles (ὠφελιωτέρους, 24).⁶⁹

The importance of usefulness as a criterion for the assessment of political acts is emphasised again at the close of the digression on the career of Theseus, thus linking the digression to the argument outlined in the proem (and thereby bringing some unity to the work). Theseus' political reforms were useful to Athens, and 'the benefits were given to all in common' (ὠφελείας, 36).⁷⁰ Reading this claim through the lens of the proem's argument, suggests that Isocrates, like Theseus, is beneficial to Athens; the political claims run alongside the educative ones.

The digression on the achievements of Theseus, occasioned by Theseus' role as the first abductor of Helen, marks this as a *politikos logos*.⁷¹ Isocrates' explicit justification for the digression is rhetorical: that showing the pre-eminence of those who sought Helen will provide the grounds for praising Helen (22). He suggests that we are not in a position to dispute the contemporary judgement of events so far in the past and should simply agree with 'those of that time who were of sound opinion' (εὖ φρονήσασιν, 22); if Theseus thought Helen the most beautiful, we should accept his view. This paradoxical assertion is an extension of Isocrates' use of myth in argument, playing with his readers' inability to know anything

with certainty about a distant past which was nonetheless valorised as a source of important values and exempla.

However, the digression also serves to characterise political virtue as an inherently Athenian quality, and thus to legitimate the Athenian claim to hegemony over the Panhellenic alliance that was Isocrates' overarching political project, as suggested by Too and Kennedy.⁷² But these interpretations do insufficient justice to Isocrates' use of the discourse of kingship to convey his argument. Isocrates takes elements from the myths of Theseus, often related to Athenian cult, and transforms them into political myths, narratives that exemplify Theseus' possession of important political capabilities and character virtues, and that are directly responsible for the present political character of the city and its citizens. The emphasis on usefulness (1, 24, 36) links Isocrates and Theseus as benefactors of Athens; like Theseus (36), Isocrates has taken the 'more laborious' (ἐπιπονώτερον) path, by producing discourses that are 'in the public interest and trustworthy' (κοινοὶ καὶ πιστοί, 11) unlike those of his rivals.

Isocrates' detailed account of Theseus in the *Helen*, floating as it is between history and myth, lacks some of the synchronisms that mark later *Atticides* and earlier tragic accounts. While he links Theseus to Heracles (as in *To Demonicus* 8), and compares the usefulness of their separate labours (*Helen* 23–5), he does not try to synchronise the two heroes into the same generation, so that his Theseus can receive the Heraclids into Attica (*Helen* 31), although he may be following Euripides in this.⁷³

This emphasis on the mythical kings as the sole authors of the great Athenian deeds marks a significant change in the discourse of kingship in Athens. Isocrates in his *Helen* moves on from the depiction of the Athenians themselves as collective authors of their great deeds to a focus on an exemplary individual of high status. In contrast, his *Panegyricus* retains the traditional version of the canonical great deeds (54–5), in which they are performed by the collective Athenians: they 'take up war' (ἀνελόμενοι γὰρ πόλεμον, 58) and 'compel' (58) their opponents, in the case of the Heraclids and the Argive dead. In the wars against the Thracians under Eumolpus and the Amazons, the emphasis is on Athens itself as a single, unitary entity contrasted with all the others and deserving specific attention from Greece's enemies (μίαν μὲν πόλιν, 68). The review of the Athenian great deeds closes in conventional comparison between the men of the earlier days and the Marathon generation (71). Throughout this work Isocrates' purpose is to establish the claim of Athens to leadership of the Panhellenic alliance he proposes, as its role in the return of the Heraclids established: 'our city had the status of a leader' (ἡγεμονικῶς εἶχεν, 57).⁷⁴ But here he retains the conventional attribution of the city's deeds and character virtues to its collective citizenry, as displayed in funeral speech rhetoric of the time, exemplified by the speech attributed to Lysias.⁷⁵

Compared with this conventional description of Athenian greatness, the different account of Theseus' military and political career in the *Helen* becomes salient. The great deeds are subsumed into Theseus' career, along with the political development of the polis, more traditionally attributed to Theseus. While, as noted, Isocrates comments on the space he allocates to various elements of the Theseus

story (*Helen* 29), none of the elements is misplaced for his argumentative purposes, which require a change of focus from the mythical deeds beloved of vase painters to the political actions that explain Theseus' role in unifying Athens and establishing its political identity.

Isocrates uses the traditional mythical narratives to establish Theseus' character virtues, and also to establish Athens' superiority through myth. Linking and comparing Theseus and Heracles was a feature of Athenian culture, evident in civic imagery such as the frieze of the Hephaestion, overlooking the Agora. Isocrates remakes the comparison, examining the usefulness of the deeds performed by the two heroes. Heracles' greater suffering and greater fame are compared to the greater usefulness of the deeds performed by Theseus (24–5). Being Athenian enables Theseus to be superior, because unlike the enslaved labouring Heracles, he 'is his own master' (αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ κύριος ὢν) and able to choose his own labours with an eye to becoming 'a benefactor (εὐεργέτης) of the Greeks and his own country' (25). This is exemplified by his choice of the mission to Crete to free Athens from the subjection that requires it to send children as sacrificial victims; it was 'better to die than to live as ruler (*archōn*) of the city compelled to pay this tribute' (27). The deeds of the narrative myths are reinterpreted to fit the political profile that Isocrates is building, and to display the character virtues that Isocrates attributes to Theseus as part of this process.

In particular, Isocrates presents Theseus as making a clear choice between tyranny and good rule (*Helen* 32–4). Bad rulers who oppress their fellow citizens are 'not rulers but diseases of their cities' (οὐχ ἄρχοντας ἀλλὰ νοσήματα τῶν πόλεων, 34).⁷⁶ Theseus rejects this option by adopting a virtuous but unconventional one-man aristocracy in which he is accorded power equivalent to that of a tyrant (τυραννεῖν) yet retained the benefits of 'participating as an equal citizen' (ἐξ ἴσου πολιτευομένων, 34). Because his power rests on the assent generated by his virtuous participation in civic life, it escapes the negative aspects of tyranny even though in terms of power it is equivalent to it.

This focus on the change of constitution is typical of those included in *politeiai* (cf. *Ath. Pol.* 41), and may also have featured in the *Atthides*. Here the change is emphasised by a detailed consideration of the kind of constitution that Theseus could have adopted. His rejection of tyranny in favour of good kingship is made explicit; he rejects such markers of tyranny as the use of bodyguards, constant warfare, the use of foreign troops to oppress citizens, impiety and the arbitrary use of capital punishment (33), while he exemplifies in his deeds a range of virtues.

Although Isocrates has established that Theseus demonstrated virtue 'through the deeds which have been narrated' (31), his virtue and *sōphrosunē* were even more apparent in the deeds with which he administered (διώκησεν) the city (31). The remainder of the digression provides a political analysis of the constitutional arrangements made by Theseus for post-synoecism Athens. Here Isocrates' analysis is somewhat different from other accounts, in emphasising continuing leadership by Theseus.⁷⁷

The characterisation of Theseus owes as much to philosophical and sophistic accounts of the good statesman as to historical or mythical narrative accounts.

The list of Theseus' political virtues is almost canonical (31): courage (ἀνδρίαν), knowledge (ἐπιστήμην), piety (εὐσέβειαν), and linking them all, 'the other virtue, that is *sōphrosunē*'.⁷⁸ The collection of these virtues under an over-arching conception of *sōphrosunē*, 'good sense' is a more typically fourth-century response.⁷⁹ In recounting Theseus' political virtues through a narrative account of two of the Athenian canonical great deeds, Isocrates displays his rhetorical virtuosity.

The most important political deed traditionally attributed to Theseus was the synoecism of Athens, the unification of the 12 original villages of Attica, founded by Cecrops. Isocrates narrates this briefly (35); before the synoecism, the Athenians lived 'scattered and in villages' (σποράδην καὶ κατὰ κόμας); afterwards, they are free-souled 'fellow citizens' (συμπολιτευομένων) living in a 'shared fatherland' (κοινὴν τὴν πατρίδα).

Isocrates describes the constitution established by Theseus after his synoecism as a sort of 'agonistic aristocracy of virtuous equals' (ἐξ ἴσου τὴν ἄμειλλαν αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς), within which Theseus believes (πιστεύων) that nonetheless his superior skill and judgement will enable his opinions to prevail (35). There are no surviving fragments from the Atthidographers to compare; Plutarch becomes coy about his sources at this point, and his description of Theseus' political changes suggests that it was proposed to the elite as a mixed constitution, a 'non-monarchical politeia and democracy' (ἀβασίλευτον πολιτείαν προτείνων καὶ δημοκρατίαν, 24.2), with Theseus acting as a 'military commander and guardian of the laws' (νόμων φύλακι), although equality ([πολιτείαν] ἰσομοιρίαν) was emphasised in his offer to the masses.⁸⁰ This account of the constitution of Athens as a mixed constitution, a political theory concept that underwent much development in and beyond the fourth century, seems to draw on accounts later than Isocrates', but more likely works of political theory rather than Atthidographers.⁸¹

The Aristotelian *Ath Pol*, post-dating the *Helen*, goes only so far as to say that Theseus' constitution 'had the form (τάξιν) of a *politeia*' and 'leaned somewhat away from the kingly' (βασιλικῆς) (41.2), but the narrative section of the work which might have provided more detail is lost.

Isocrates describes a complex mutual transaction between Theseus and the Athenians after the synoecism. Theseus made Athenian demos 'responsible for (*kurion*) the *politeia*' (36), which promptly recognised its own best interests and returned it to him: 'they considered (ἡξίουσιν) him alone to be worthy of rule' (36). Eucken notes the use of the imperfect tense verbs to establish the continuity of the relationship between Theseus and the Athenians in this passage (*ēxioun, prosetatēten, apelauien*/ἡξίουσιν, προσέταττεν, ἀπέλαυνεν, 36).⁸² That Theseus does not 'derive pleasure' from the exercise of power is significant; the verb *apolauō* often has a negative connotation of improper pleasure or free-riding in a political context.⁸³ This picture of harmony contrasts with the threat of tyranny in the political choices that Theseus rejected (33–4). It is not so much that Theseus has rescued the Athenians from an actual tyranny, as that he has rejected tyranny himself in favour of a better form of monarchical rule; political life no longer takes place in public but in the private soul of the individual. Good kingship and bad tyranny are presented as an explicit choice for the individual monarch, but Theseus the Athenian can be

relied upon to choose the better option. Isocrates thus presents Theseus as entirely and personally responsible for the political character of his city.⁸⁴

Isocrates' presentation of Theseus' rule combines the two earlier versions available to him, in which he appears as a unifying king (as in Th. 2.15.2) and as a leading citizen in democracy (as in Euripides' *Suppliant Women*).⁸⁵ His complex presentation of the Athenian polity becomes part of the complicated argument of his paradoxical dialogue. In disclaiming his kingship, and being chosen in return by the citizens who deem him to be superior to them, Theseus truly becomes a king, a king who is acceptable within a framework that seems to be established within a democratic context. Election to kingship by worthy citizens is a feature of Herodotean kingship narratives, and marks those kings whom he regards as more than simple despots.⁸⁶ What Isocrates is not claiming here is that Theseus gives up his kingship and turns his back on politics: he is not a Platonic philosopher king seeking the contemplative life, nor is he like Herodotus' Solon, leaving the Athenians to manage themselves under the pretext of seeking knowledge (Hdt. 1.29.1). It is his continuing presence that has created the mild character that persists in Athens: 'still even now a trace of that man's gentleness (πρᾶξις) has been left in our habits (τοῖς ἥθεσιν ἡμῶν)' (37).

The presentation of Theseus as king in the much later *Panathenaicus* is a different matter, although it retains the view that the good features of the Athenian constitution are dependent on its monarchical origins. But this Theseus does give up his political role in Athens to return to his other role performing heroic deeds, in what at first sight is a version of the Euripidean model (127–8). He does this in the prime of life (ἄκμαζον, 129), so that he can leave and perform useful and heroic deeds, on behalf of both Athens and Greece as a whole.⁸⁷ This inversion of the usual chronology makes it the novelty that Isocrates claims; it also allows Isocrates to separate Theseus and his continuing Panhellenic heroism from good government in Athens. Close reading of the *Panathenaicus* reveals a strand of praise of Macedon at odds with the apparent praise of Athens that should be the subject of the speech.

While in the *Helen*, Isocrates represented Theseus choosing between kingship and tyranny, and preferring the choice which enabled the Athenians to live equally in freedom, here the choice the king makes is more complex and perhaps owes something to the philosophical debate about the choice of lives. Withdrawal from politics had not been an acceptable choice in earlier times (at least in the version of democratic ideology presented by Thucydides in the funeral speech), but the fourth-century picture was more complicated. Isocrates has moved the significance of Theseus away from the usual link with Athenian leaders such as Pericles, and towards monarchical figures such as Philip. This is a choice of lives different from that available to any Athenian citizen. Theseus has been reassigned: where in earlier accounts he clearly represents the democratic politicians of Athens (typically Pericles), here he has been transformed into a cipher for Philip of Macedon.⁸⁸ Isocrates' argument can be read as anti-Philip and pro-democratic, rather than a pro-Macedonian partisan; in such a reading, he provides Athenian politicians with an argument to persuade Philip away from involvement in domestic Athenian politics, should he gain direct control of the city.

Again, there are complications within the presentation of the argument, and typically Isocratean rhetorical games to disentangle. Isocrates here engages in a form of *praeteritio*, where he deliberately seeks out a new angle so that he does not need to repeat his previous work (126–7), but recalls its contents in avoiding repetition. But there are other changes, suggesting that Isocrates is reshaping his thought in response to others: Theseus' virtues are now said to be exemplified by 'practical wisdom (*phronēseōs*)' (127); *sōphrosunē* has been replaced by *phronēsis* as the form of intellectual virtue.⁸⁹

Isocrates' new Theseus narrative differs from other accounts, which start to appear in this period, in which Theseus' loss of rule is an unhappy one, caused by the introduction of demagoguery to his democracy. What Theseus turns his back on is 'a most secure and great monarchy (βασιλείαν ἀσφαλεστάτην καὶ μεγίστην)' (129); Isocrates presents this as an example of Theseus' austere virtue, in that he prefers heroic toil abroad to an easy life at home, and that he does this before he has derived enjoyment from (ἀπολελαυκῶς) participation in the polis (129).⁹⁰

The digression on Agamemnon (72–83) is widely regarded as a nod to Philip, underlining the hopes that Isocrates expressed in his *Philip* that the Macedonian king would serve as a Panhellenic leader, just as Agamemnon had done during the Trojan War.⁹¹ Agamemnon is an example where the earlier tradition praises the individual leader, as well as the collective; Homer was a reliable source of political exempla for many theorists.⁹²

This account of Theseus is preceded by a brief Athenian king-list, as Roth notes (126).⁹³ Perhaps even more than in the *Helen*, Isocrates is drawing on the local historical tradition. But this is different from the invocation of the Athenian monarchical past that has been seen developing in the Atthidographers.⁹⁴ Isocrates has appropriated the structures of Athenian patriotism for his own Panhellenic purposes, and to fashion a role within his recreated imaginary for Philip as the absent king.⁹⁵ An ostensible homage to Athenian foundation myth notes the activities of Philip, contemporary with the drafting of the speech. The continuance of the dynasty is stressed (125) and identified as something rare, which the Macedonian dynasty certainly was when judged against the recent political history of Greek *poleis*. Philip, a monarch in his prime, had left Macedon in the hands of the young Alexander while he pursued foreign campaigns in 340; this matches the new model of Theseus' career that Isocrates introduces here.

The pay-off from Isocrates' invocation of Athenian founder myth is that Theseus, so often identified with democratic politicians such as Pericles, can be presented as an analogue of a foreign king whose interests are beneficial to the city.⁹⁶ The repositioning of Athenian kingship which had begun with the development of Atthidography had changed pace and direction; here is a text aimed at a non-Athenian audience, providing Athenian exemplars for how non-Athenians, in this case Philip as king, should behave.

The vision of Athens which Isocrates develops is one in which a monarch, absent from the city on heroic duties, entrusts power to a group of virtuous leaders who are in sympathy with democracy but resemble the monarch in character (139). These leaders then go on to establish an idealised constitution that emphasises

virtue (143–4). This seems remarkably similar to the constitutional arrangements put in place after Athens' surrender to the Macedonians in 323.

Isocrates' Athenian example of good government relies on the presence of kings to set it going. The good qualities of his Athenian *patrios politeia* are due to its kingly origins; the kings 'educated the masses in virtue, justice and good sense' and taught the citizens that the *politeia* is the soul of the state (138).⁹⁷ Isocrates uses the model of Athenian kingship that has been developed through the recasting of Athenian history to attribute the most characteristically positive quality of the Athenian citizen body to the individual acts of its kings. Athens, unlike Sparta, which will be the focus of criticism in the next section of the speech, provides the best model for monarchical rule.

Reading this section (138–48) with the Theseus–Philip link in mind produces a much more powerful restatement of Isocrates' political thought, in which the relationship between Athenian domestic politics and an external monarch is established, providing a blueprint for Athens' future under Macedonian domination. Norlin's view that the *Panathenaicus* is a tired, feeble work with nothing new to say becomes untenable.⁹⁸ The central passages of the *Panathenaicus* contain the most detailed exposition of Isocrates' thought on the government of Athens, as well as a further assertion of Athens' superiority to Sparta, this time presented as Lycurgus' imitation of the Athenian *patrios politeia* (153–4). The relationship between Athenian democracy and its founding monarchy can remain the same, whether the monarch is the imaginary Theseus or the absent Philip.

The king as rhetorical exemplar for citizens

Although Theseus was the central culture hero of Athenian myth, he was not immune to criticism, as his story was retold and repurposed by rival writers; this is evident from the many different sources and stories contained in Plutarch's *Life of Theseus*. Retelling the story of Theseus could involve all the measures described above for talking about the past: rationalisation of myth, expansion to achieve *akribeia*, changing signification to attach the story to new contemporary events.

Fortuitously, the Athenian store of mythical kings could cope with the devaluation of Theseus as an exemplar. Theseus was a stranger king (like several of Herodotus' exemplar kings) and therefore somewhat problematic in the city that valued autochthony.⁹⁹ Other kings were arguably more Athenian, and could be better exemplars than the autochthonous first kings from the time before Theseus and synoecism. Exploring these earliest kings also promoted Attidography's prime claim, the assertion that Athenian culture stretched far into an unbroken past. As we saw in Chapter 2, these kings had also interested the tragedians.¹⁰⁰

Cecrops, Erechtheus/Erichthonios could be pressed into service, and especially Codrus, as examples of good leadership and self-sacrifice. For example, when Xenophon depicts Socrates and the younger Pericles discussing how the young Athenian can become a better general (*Memorabilia* 3.5), Socrates urges him to encourage the Athenians to rediscover their ancient character virtues. The way to do this, Socrates suggests, is to recall their most ancient ancestors (τοὺς γε

παλαιάτους, 3.5.9); Pericles needs little prompting to suggest the story of contest of the gods at the foundation of Athens, which Cecrops and his advisers were allowed 'to decide through their virtue/excellence (ἀρετήν)' (3.5.10). Socrates follows through with a miniature funeral speech, in which Theseus' leadership is mentioned, but virtue attributed to the collective Athenians under his leadership: 'they were the best (ἄριστεύσαντες) of the men of their time' (3.5.10).¹⁰¹

Codrus has received less attention than Theseus, but he was important in Athenian cult, had seen this cult develop during the Peloponnesian War (*IG* i³ 84) and seems to have become the ideal monarch to represent individual courage and virtue, especially as his heroism saved the city from the Spartans during an earlier Spartan invasion of Attica.¹⁰² When the priestess Diotima provides exemplars for Socrates to imitate on his intellectual journey, Codrus is one of the elite examples she enlists (*Pl. Smp.* 208d4–5). But this mention of Codrus, made as it is by an imaginary priestess, remains within the mythical usage of the kings, just as in the *Phaedo* Plato analogises Socrates' intellectual journey to the travels of Theseus.

However, in the changing context of Athens after defeat by Philip of Macedon at Chaeronea in 331–330 BCE, the Athenian politician Lycurgus presents Athenian kings as models of behaviour for citizens.¹⁰³ His speech *Against Leocrates* presents both Erechtheus and Codrus as exemplars of courage and good citizenship for citizens to emulate in the sacrifices they made for the city; Erechtheus giving up his daughter, Codrus his own life. It is Lycurgus' lengthy citation which transmits the speech of Praxithea; in the context of Lycurgus' delivery of his speech, Joanna Hanink notes how the embedded quotation produces 'a plurality of voices blended together in praise of Athens'; through the quotation, Lycurgus can present himself as almost a king and part of the Athenian mythical heritage.¹⁰⁴

Codrus becomes the standard of Athenian courage that the unfortunate Leocrates has failed to emulate, in a forensic speech rather than a drama; the use of the story in this different genre emphasises the shift in usage of kings from the mythical to the historical.¹⁰⁵ Lycurgus contrasts Codrus' self-sacrifice in fulfilment of an oracle with Leocrates' decision to leave Athens, in a case which itself is a dubious extension of the *eisangelia* charge to the private life of a citizen.¹⁰⁶ Codrus' decision to sacrifice his life is represented as a typical but noteworthy instance of the deliberately chosen behaviour of ancient Athenian kings in general: 'the men who were kings then were so noble (γενναῖοι) that they chose (προηροῦντο) to die for the protection (*sōtērias*) of those they ruled' (86), a point repeated with an explicit contrast with Leocrates in the closing of the anecdote (88). Athenian kingship myth is here linked to the fourth-century interest in the political consequences of individual choice (*prohairesis*); the choices attributed to kings are more patriotic and praiseworthy than those of individuals who have failed to exemplify the desired values.¹⁰⁷

Lycurgus, in using Codrus and Erechtheus as exempla, was perhaps drawing on the knowledge of his 'minister of public worship and education', as Jacoby labelled him, the Atthidographer Phanodemos.¹⁰⁸ While Lycurgus acknowledges the role of the assembled Athenians in both military encounters, framing both stories within the context of the deeds of the Athenians' 'ancestors' (πρόγονοι, 85; τῶν παλαιῶν,

98), he holds up the choices made by the royal individuals, including Praxithea, wife of Erechtheus, for imitation. The implication is that the ancient king exhibits a standard of virtue and courage that is not achievable by ordinary citizens; the citizens become bystanders, rescued from defeat by a pre-eminent individual. The present Athenians should acknowledge the heroism of their eponymous heroes by honouring those ‘distinguished by virtue’ (τοὺς τῇ ἀρετῇ διαφέροντας, 89) with ‘honours equal to those of the gods’ (ἰσοθέων τιμῶν, 88). The Cleisthenian appropriation of Athenian myth for democratic purposes is further reinvented for a new context in which the virtue of individual leaders (such as the kings of Macedon and their Athenian opponents) becomes the focus of debate.

Conclusion

The discourse of kingship in Athens spread across many literary genres as they developed in the growing literary culture of the city in the fourth century BCE, from narrative history to political rhetoric. While king-lists served as a way to connect with the distant past, narratives of the mythical deeds of the founder kings, retold using the generic features of historical narratives, could be used to provide exemplars of good citizenship and personal virtue. Euripides had used Theseus as a model citizen, representing the Athenian citizen on stage, but Isocrates adapted myths and historical accounts based on them to produce a model Theseus who served as an example for citizens to imitate. The idea that the mythical, or reimagined as historical, monarch should serve as an example for imitation would be further developed by Isocrates, Lysurgus and others. But such use of historical and mythical exemplary individuals as *paradeigmata* would be opposed by Plato, in the course of the exposition of his own political thought in the *Statesman*, *Timaeus*/*Critias* and the *Laws*.

Notes

- 1 Kleidemos *FGrH* 323 F17, F18; McInerney 1994; Pelling 1999, 2002b: 171–196. Some ancient authorities (unlike Jacoby, the major authority on Athenian local history) regarded the fourth-century Kleidemos (Kleitodemos in some sources), rather than the fifth-century Hellanicus, as the ‘most ancient’ historian of Athens or Attidographer (*FGrH* 323 T1 = Pausanias 10.15.5, ὁ ἀρχαιότατος, Jacoby 1954a: 61).
- 2 Pownall 2007 explores the transition of Greek elite education alongside that from oral-ity to literacy, cf. Nicolai 2004: 13–17 on rhetoric.
- 3 Singular *Atthis*. The authors and dates of the *Atthides* are as follows: Hellanicus (of Lesbos), late fifth century, 2 or 4 books, *FrGH* 323a; Klei(to)demos (of Athens), probably 380–350, 4 books, *FrGH* 323; Androtion, after 344–343, 8 books, *FrGH* 324; Phanodemos, after 329–328, 9 books, *FrGH* 325; Melanthis, unknown date and length, *FrGH* 326; Demon, probably 300–250, 4 books, *FrGH* 327; and Philochorus, before 260, 17 books, *FrGH* 328. The vast literature begins with Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1893: i.260–90 and the monumental Jacoby 1949, and includes Rhodes 1990, 2014 and Harding 2007, 2008. The latter pair have criticised Jacoby’s positioning of the *Atthides* in a political context (Jacoby 1949: 51–70), while also resisting Wilamowitz’ assimilation of these historical works to the more religious Roman *Fasti* (Rhodes 2014: 12–13).

- 4 For a new survey, setting the Athenian local histories within a broader historiographic trend, see Thomas 2019: 11–12, 316–57.
- 5 Jacoby 1909; Marincola 1999: 283–301; Schepens 1997.
- 6 Mitchell 2008: 17–21 explores Thucydides' use of Theseus.
- 7 On Isocrates and Sparta, see Attack 2018c; Blank 2013; on his use of myth see Haskins 2004; Masaracchia 1995, 2003.
- 8 See [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 3.2–5.
- 9 Greta Hawes notes Plutarch's own analogy between space and time, likening the distant past to Scythia (2014: 149–50).
- 10 DH *De Thuc.* 9 = *FrGH* 4 T11, Toye 1995. Later texts of the Roman imperial period reverse this process; Pausanias' guide to Attica and Strabo's geography reallocate myths to specific cult sites across Athens and Attica.
- 11 Flower and Marincola 2002: 238–9. This passage has a complex function in its prolepsis to the Peloponnesian War. It may catch the resurgent interest in Athenian kings as political actors that marked Athenian rhetoric towards the end of the war. Alternatively, Herodotus' Athenian sources were pro-democratic and uninterested in kingship myth, and he simply echoes their interests.
- 12 Hdt. 9.97 mentions Neileus, son of Codrus, founder of a temple of Demeter of Eleusis at Mycale. This example falls into the topographic set. Luce (2005) contrasts the civic Athenian locations (the old agora) associated with Theseus with the cult locations (the Acropolis) associated with the other Athenian kings.
- 13 Lévêque and Vidal-Naquet 1996: 9–17. DH *De Thuc.* 9 = *FrGH* 4 T11; Toye (1995).
- 14 Although this synchronism falls within the time Herodotus elsewhere identifies as before history (3.122). On Codrus and historiography, see Harding 2008: 80–1; Jacoby 1954a: 44, 1954b: 51–2 nn.14–16.
- 15 Marincola 2007; Tully 2014.
- 16 The most detailed account remains Kearns 1989.
- 17 Set out in Gehrke 1994, 2001, 2004, cf. Gehrke 2011, and further examined in Foxhall et al. 2010, cf. Jacoby 1949: 133–43; Schepens 2001 applies the concept to Athenian local history. Raaflaub 2010 reduces the concept of intentional history to 'ulterior motives', while Grethlein 2010: 328–32 explores its philosophical origins.
- 18 Universal in extent of space and time covered (Marincola 2007: 172–3; Schepens 1977: 102–5). See Tully 2014 for a critical assessment of the sub-genre.
- 19 As Rhodes 2014: 14–15 suggests.
- 20 The generation of the Athenian king-list has received much attention: Jacoby 1902; Schwartz 1895.
- 21 Clarke 2008; Lévêque and Vidal-Naquet 1996: 9–17.
- 22 Rhodes 2014: 32.
- 23 Clarke 2008: 64–70, 208–15; Fowler 2013: 685–7. Harding (1993: 49) argues that Thucydides' criticism of Hellanicus precludes any assumption that his *Attikē sungraphē* was a historical chronicle (1.97.2).
- 24 Hippias *BNJ* 6; Hellanicus *FrGH* 4; Joyce 1999. Thucydides criticises these systems for imprecision (Th. 5.20.2) and adds the use of seasons to increase precision: Möller 2001: 254–62; Węcowski 2012.
- 25 Hdt. 6.52 (Sparta), 8.137.1, 139 (Macedon). Hornblower 1991–2008: 2.490–3; Smart 1986.
- 26 Leyden 1949–50. This contrasts with the explicit separation drawn between the two (or the near past and the 'plupast', as identified by Jonas Grethlein) that characterises Thucydidean contemporary history: see Grethlein and Krebs 2012: 1–11. In Attidography this 'plupast' is not distinguished in kind from the recent past, but simply precedes it in continuous narrative, cf. Cartledge 2002b: 293–8; Jacoby, 1949: 88–9; 1954a: 11–12 n.119, 1954b: 15–17. The Athenian archon-list: *ML* 6 = *IG* i³ 1031, Bradeen 1963.
- 27 Carrière 1998; Fowler 2013; Gotteland 1998.

- 28 Hellanicus *FGrH* 323a F23, Demon *FGrH* 326 F5.
- 29 *Marmor Parium* (*FGrH* 239 1–31), Castor of Rhodes, *FGrH* 250 F4. Grethlein and Krebs 2012. On duplications within king-lists: Clarke 2008: 73–5; Harding 2008: 12–13, 73–5; Jacoby 1902; Jacoby 1929: 1140–1, 1930: 666–71, 823–4, and especially the detailed analysis in Fowler 2013: 447–55. On the *Marmor Parium* see Rotstein 2016.
- 30 The pseudo-Xenophontic Athenian constitution may provide a parallel: Bordes 1982: 20–1, 139–63; Jacoby 1949: 196–9, 292 n.13; Ober 1998: 22–3. Ober argues that the audience/readership for the [Xen] *Ath. Pol.* includes members of non-Athenian as well as Athenian elites, and this may also be true of Hellanicus' work if explaining Athenian myth was its focus.
- 31 Jacoby 1949: 70–1, 1954a: 1–6.
- 32 Harpokration. s.v. Ἀλόπη = 323a F6 (*Atthis* book 2). Hellanicus' other works are also cited as sources by scholiasts on Euripides: see *FGrH* 4 F21 (*Atlantis*, scholiast to Eur. *Phoen.* 159), 4 F94 (*Phoronidos*; scholiast to *Rhesus* 29) 4 F96–98 (*Phoronidos*; scholiast to Eur. *Phoen.* 662, 61, 71), 4 F133 (*Argonautika/Deukonaleia*; scholiast to *Medea* 9).
- 33 Suida s.v. Hellanicus *FGrH* 4=323a T1.
- 34 Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983.
- 35 Jacoby finds two traditions present in the fourth century, one that interposed life archons between the kings and the ten-year archons (Jacoby 1954b: 11–13 nn.119–21), and one that did not (which he regards as earlier). Cf. Eur. *Supp.* 352–3; Isoc. *Helen* 34–5.
- 36 Jacoby 1954a: 47–8.
- 37 After finding his daughter with a lover, he shuts her in a room with a horse, until she is dead; see (2008: 84–5). See Chapter 1; Hdt. 2.162–76: cf. *FGrH* 90 F49.
- 38 Argued by Grube 1926; Tarrant 1928; Woodruff 1982, and supported by Hudson-Williams 1948: 79–80, arguing that the prefix *archaio-* acts as both an object of the main verb and an adverb modifying it, = ἀρχαῖα ἀρχαίως λέγειν, (in line with other -λογεω compounds such as the more common μακρολογέω, speak at length). But Hudson-Williams fails to link the *archaia*, the content of the speech with its frequent mentions of heroic past deeds, to the *patria/pater* vocabulary (πατρώθεν τε ἐπονομάζων, τὰς πατρικὰς ἀρετὰς, πατρίδος τε τῆς ἐλευθερωτάτης, θεοὺς πατρώους, all in 7.69.2), of the speech that precedes the authorial comment. It seems that the content, the listing of ancestors and heroic deeds, is part of what makes Nicias' speech old-fashioned, and not just his manner of speaking.
- 39 Connor 1984: 20–32.
- 40 D'Angour 2011: 223–4 notes the emphasis on novelty elsewhere in fourth-century rhetoric.
- 41 Cf. Marincola 1997: 276–7.
- 42 Calame 1998: 139–41; cf. Attack 2018d.
- 43 The fragment is cited along with *Paneg.* 8 in Harpokration's lexicon: *FGrH* 70 F9 = HARPOKR. s. ἀρχαίως.
- 44 Calame 1998: 136 n.14; Gotteland 2001: 220–4.
- 45 On Isocrates' use of history for exemplars, see Marincola 2014. On appeals to past *politeiai* see Attack 2018d.
- 46 Cf. Arist. *Poetics* 1450a38–b11, on the lack of universality in history.
- 47 *Hipp Mai* 285d6= *FGrH* 6 T3: cf. Pownall 2007: 5–37; Thomas 1989. The *Hippias Maior* discussion of history satirises both Hippias and his probable son-in-law Isocrates, for reliance on historical argument (Marincola 1999: 293).
- 48 This is the earliest extant instance of the noun *archaiologia* (*LSJ*).
- 49 Isocrates *Helen* 18–37, especially 32–7, *Panathenaicus* 123–9; Lycurgus *Against Leocrates* 86–7, 98–101.

- 50 Dillery 1995; Gray 1989; Pownall 2004: 65–112 examine Xenophon's *Hellenica* as historiography, Hägg 2012: 10–66 Xenophon's exemplary lives as biographies.
- 51 Ober 1996: see also Azoulay and Ismard 2011, especially Flaig 2011.
- 52 *Contra* Schepens 2001.
- 53 *Ath. Pol.* Fr. 4, Plutarch *Kimon* 8.5–6, *Theseus* 36.1, Blamire 1989: 119–20; Castriota 1992: 33–63. Fowler (2013: 468) distinguishes the depiction of Theseus in earlier mythographers from that of the Atthidographers.
- 54 Mills 1997; Mitchell 2008.
- 55 Cf. Hdt. 1.96–101 (Deioces' unification of the Medes); Walker 1994: 197–8. On *diakosmēsis*, see Schofield 2019. Calame (1996: 221–3) links Thucydides' portrayal of Theseus to his earlier description of thalassocracy (1.6).
- 56 Greta Hawes cautions that Plutarch's aims may differ from those of the Atthidographers (2014: 153–4), and that one cannot draw secure inferences about the Atthidographers' narrative structures from Plutarch's.
- 57 Cf. Veyne 1988: 13–14, 133 n.23.
- 58 Hansen 1975, *Xen. Hell.* 6.2.14–30 (Iphicrates), 5.4.64 (Timotheus).
- 59 Plutarch (*Thes.* 32.1) also addresses Menestheus' exploitation of aristocratic resentment of Theseus' reforms; Pelling 2002b: 181–4.
- 60 ps-Plut. *Vit. Dec. Or.* 837e.
- 61 Many of Isocrates' works can be dated from internal historical references (Mandilaras 2003: 1.6); purely mythical references make this difficult for the *Helen* and *Busiris*, and works' dramatic dates may differ from their composition dates: (Eucken 1983: 44, 173–83; Too 1995: 42–5).
- 62 Too 1995; Harding 1988.
- 63 As suggested by *Helen* 1–13 and *Against the Sophists*. Eucken 1983 presents the case for Isocrates' work as a response to Plato. Mathieu (1925: 200–2) also links him to historiographers, as their teacher; Too (1995: 233–4) considers Isocrates as a voice of 'otherness' subverting the language of democratic participation with his individualism.
- 64 Masaracchia 2003.
- 65 Marincola 2014.
- 66 Cf. Jaeger 1939: 71–83.
- 67 Questioning the structure and unity of the *Helen* is itself an established rhetorical topos, *Arist. Rhet.* 3.14.1414b27–28, Kennedy 1958; Papillon 1996; Poulakos 1986.
- 68 Varying composition dates have been proposed for the *Helen* within the 380s/370s (Norlin and Van Hook 1928–45: 3.59; Zajonz 2002: 58–9). Kennedy (1958: 82–3) argues that it is a 'fanciful counterpart' to the *Panegyricus* and thus contemporary with it. Heilbrunn (1977: 147) argues that it is a 'sophistic-rhetorical' work rather than a political one, but no Athenian discourse about Theseus can be apolitical.
- 69 This point connects the *Helen* to the *Euthydemus*, where Socrates fails to become Heracles (*Euth.* 297b10–c5); see next chapter.
- 70 Kennedy 1958: 77.
- 71 Reading the *Helen* as a response to Gorgias is one way to provide a degree of unity: (Kennedy 1958; Papillon 1996).
- 72 Kennedy 1958: 80–1; Too 1995: 129–30; Kennedy links the praise of Athens in the digression to that in the *Panegyricus* (citing 39 and 80ff.), and interprets the *Helen* as praise of Hellenism, and as advancing the Athenian claim for hegemony of a Panhellenic alliance over Sparta's.
- 73 Whereas Euripides allocated this deed to Theseus' son Demophon (*Heracleidae*); see Chapter 2.
- 74 Bringmann 1965: 19–27; Kennedy 1958.
- 75 Treating [Lysias] 2.17–19 as a classic example, in which the collective strength of the Athenians is based on their autochthonous origin, shared democratic values and subjection to law and reason.

- 76 Cf. *Pl. Rep.* 8.544c6. The metaphor of tyranny as disease is used elsewhere by both authors (Zajonz 2002: 200).
- 77 It most closely resembles Euripides' model in *Supp.* 352–3, particularly in the emphasis on freedom as a consequence of Theseus' constitutional reforms.
- 78 Kehl 1962; Zajonz (2002: 192–3) notes that *sōphrosunē* is a key political virtue for Isocrates, cf. *Nicoles* 30, 43, *Evagoras* 22.
- 79 Or at least, a response to the Socratic doctrine of the unity of the virtues and its associated intellectualism.
- 80 The latter point also appears in Heraclides' epitome of *Ath. Pol.* 11.
- 81 Rowe 2000: 394–5.
- 82 Eucken 1983: 97.
- 83 See also *Panath.* 129 and n.90.
- 84 Isocrates similarly collapses Plato's city-soul analogy in his aphorism 'the soul of a city is nothing other than its *politeia*' (*Areop.* 14)
- 85 Jacoby 1954a, 1954b (on *FGrH* 328 F19 nn.9 and 10); Zajonz 2002: 205–7.
- 86 See Chapter 1. Deioeces, chosen to be king of Medes by the free Medes (Hdt 1.97.2–3) is the prime example.
- 87 Roth 2003: 159 n.343.
- 88 Kehl 1962; Masaracchia 1995: 109–10; Roth 2003: 162.
- 89 In line with Aristotle and the later Plato (*Laws* 1.631c5–d1), although the terms are equivalent but separate at 1.630b1.
- 90 Cf. *Pl. Rep.* 1.330d2: Socrates asks Cephalus to identify the greatest good he has derived from his life; *Xen. Mem.* 1.6.2, where Antiphon alleges that Socrates' students have failed to derive the usual benefits from studying philosophy. *Apolausis* and related terms in Aristotle seem to be purely physical pleasures (*Pol.* 1.10.1258a3, 5.11.1314b28, *NE* 1.5.1095b14–22) but, within a civic context, ones derived from improper relationships to the polity.
- 91 Race 1978.
- 92 Th. 1.9.1; see next chapter for the use of Homeric kings as examples by Antisthenes (as in his surviving declamations of Ajax and Odysseus, *SSR* Frs. 53–54) and Xenophon (*Smp.* 4.6, *Mem.* 3.1.4, 3.2.1), cf. Giannantoni 1990: IV.257–64, 327–30.
- 93 Roth 2003: 156.
- 94 The *Panathenaicus*, from 326–323, most likely predates the late-fourth or early-third century *Athides* of Demon and Phanodemos.
- 95 Masaracchia 1995: 109–10; Roth 2003: 162.
- 96 The biographical tradition (ps-Plutarch, *Vit. Dec. Or.* 837e) suggests that Philip's actions immediately subsequent to Athens' defeat led the elderly Isocrates to refuse further food and give up on life.
- 97 Masaracchia 1995: 110–11. Isocrates here recycles his own maxim on the *politeia*, from *Areopagiticus* 14, a work in which Athens' good qualities were attributed to its aristocratic elite.
- 98 Norlin and Van Hook 1928–45: 2.369–71.
- 99 On stranger kings see Sahlins and Graeber 2017: 5–7; Sahlins 2017b.
- 100 Hanink 2013, 2014b connect the orators' interest with tragic precedents.
- 101 Dorion and Bandini 2011: 297–300; Loraux 1993a: 86–7, 371 n.159; McNamara 2009: 235. Loraux notes the reorientation of funeral speech motifs here, as an example of fourth-century political exploitation of Theseus myth, but does not consider the implications of highlighting Athens' other kings. The emphasis on Macedon in the description of the Persian War here (*Xen. Mem.* 3.5.11) perhaps indicates the contemporary reshaping of this story, anachronistically given by Xenophon to his Socrates.
- 102 Kearns 1989: 56–7, 1990; Lawton 1995: 83–4.
- 103 The published version most likely expands on that delivered in the court.
- 104 Hanink 2014b: 36.

105 Lycurg. *Leoc.* 86–7.

106 Azoulay 2011: 197–204.

107 Allen 2006: 210–14 notes Lycurgus' use of this theme but does not investigate the attribution of desirable *prohairesis* to Athenian kings, as exemplified by Isocrates' Theseus.

108 Jacoby 1954a: 172; see also: Allen 2000; Azoulay 2009; Humphreys 2004: 77–129; Steinbock 2011 on Lycurgus and his use of myth.

4 Kingship and Socratic thought

Socrates' paradoxical claim that there would be no respite from evil for cities until philosophers ruled as kings, or kings became philosophers (*Rep.* 473cd) may take modern readers by surprise. But this 'third wave' of his argument would have been less shocking for Plato's contemporary readers, already immersed in the discourse of kingship through the new historical interest in kings demonstrated by historians, the rhetorical invocation of their virtue by orators and teachers, and a new analogical use of kingship within attempts to discern a 'ruling craft' (*basilikē technē*). While Plato would take this discussion in a new direction, both in terms of what ruling as a king and being a philosopher might mean, his invocation of kingship belongs firmly within this vibrant discourse. In this discourse, the Axial Age transition from an 'immanentist' view of the divine to a 'transcendentalist' conception, can be seen through the development of new claims for the authority and position of kings and other rulers, grounded in their personal qualities and achievements.¹ The thinkers considered in this chapter attempt to identify a science of kingship, possession of which grants authority to a ruler, although they struggle to do so, and do not reach agreement on the nature of the science involved.

This discourse itself depends on existing imagery of kingship, particularly as refracted through interpretations of the absolute power of Persian monarchs. As we saw in the previous chapter, changing historical circumstances towards the end of the fifth century, such as the oligarchic revolutions and defeat in the Peloponnesian War, created a space for a new analysis of good leadership in the context of the Athenian polis, and a reappraisal of forms of leadership outside the world of Athens. Existing genres of discourse provided suitable exemplars for re-exploration in new formats: mythical leaders and heroes such as Theseus and Heracles had long been used as exemplars, while historical non-Greek leaders such as Cyrus, contemporary rulers on the edge of the Greek world such as Archelaus of Macedon, and Athenian politicians such as Pericles and Alcibiades provided new examples. The development of a new literary form, the Socratic dialogue, saw their incorporation into a new form of discourse, in which writers such as Antisthenes and Xenophon begin to change their signification.² In this genre writers would use (and contest the use of) historical and mythical rulers as exemplars of leadership, good or bad, and of virtue and vice.

Beyond this, a second order of discussion developed in which exploration of what distinguished ruler and ruled would be explored both directly and through the developing conceptualisation of a specific skill of ruling, often analysed through analogies to other crafts and through being positioned hierarchically above other crafts with a unique relationship to them. Just as the relationship between ruler and polis was explored as a metaphysical problem of the relationship of one and many, parts and whole, so the relationship between ruling and other, subordinated, human skills was framed in terms of the possible qualitative difference that might ensure the primacy of ruling. Within this discussion, the ontology of different possible social arrangements and groups was explored: in comparing kingship with generalship or household management, the distinction between nations, cities, armies and households might be explored. The question of whether these were distinguished by quality or kind, and whether rule over household could be identified with that of rule over city, was an enduring problem for Greek political theorists, and ideas about how the rule of a king might be specific and different played a part in attempts to resolve this problem.

Unfortunately, the evidence for the development of important themes in Athenian political thought at this specific period, such as the development, idealisation and argumentative invocation of the ancestral constitution, or *patrios politeia*, is fragmentary, with few works surviving complete. Although later texts, such as the Aristotelian *Athenaiōn Politeia*, position their appearance in the disputes of this period, their record is incomplete and not always reliable.³ Other texts, such as the treatise known as the Anonymus Iamblichi, offer a strong critique of the idea of virtuous single-person rule; but without firm identification of the author or the date of the text, positioning this text within this discourse has proved challenging.⁴ Scholars have tended to focus on the impact of these discussions for the restoration of democracy and the character of the restored democracy, and this tendency has obscured the interest in single-person rule that develops alongside and interacts with backwards-looking thought on democracy and Athenian internal politics.⁵

The interest in single-person rule was not a purely theoretical one in early fourth-century Athens. As democratic Athens' politicians and generals negotiated with a range of sole rulers from beyond the world of the Greek polis, such as Archelaus of Macedon, Evagoras of Salamis and Dionysius I and II of Syracuse, its thinkers assessed this form of rule and the qualities of its practitioners.⁶ Even Plato's Socrates introduces a list of tyrants, as people likely to operate according to the principle of helping friends and harming enemies (*Rep.* 1.336a5–7). Fragments of Aeschines of Sphettus' *Alcibiades* contain an analysis of leadership and tyranny, in which non-Greek rule is assumed to be worse than Greek, based on the life and experiences of Themistocles (*SSR* VI A 49–50).⁷ These explorations are characterised by the use of the dialogue form.⁸ Xenophon's *Memorabilia* and Aeschines of Sphettus' fragmentary *Aspasia* (*SSR* VI A 70), both featuring Xenophon and Socrates, use dialogue to suggest a world of intense intellectual debate centred around Socrates.

The analysis of kingship was a well-established theme of such discussions, apparent in the works of Antisthenes and Xenophon. The idea of kingship as the

highest form of the craft of rule, *basilikē technē*, seems to have already entered the discourse before the term appears in the writings of Xenophon (*Mem.* 2.1.17, 4.2.11) and Plato (*Euthydemus* 291b5). These texts represent a developed debate on how one craft or skill might stand to another in the same relation as king to subject, as well as exploring the qualities and identity of the posited ruling art; they document an existing debate rather than beginning a new one.

In this debate, the themes of kingship and good leadership were addressed by using set examples, drawing on earlier texts and civic iconography, such as the use of Homeric themes and Homeric kings in Antisthenes' declamations.⁹ The insufficiency of Homeric education for the analysis of contemporary experience itself became a topos of educators seeking to establish the superiority of their own novel methods.¹⁰ The heroic life of Heracles provided further material; his traditional mythical deeds could stay in the background while current intellectual debates were foregrounded, as in Prodicus' fable of the Choice of Heracles, retold by Socrates in Xenophon's account (*Mem.* 2.1.21–34); Antisthenes' encounter between Prometheus and Heracles may provide another example of the use of mythical characters and narratives to explore ethical and political themes.¹¹

Antisthenes and single-person rule

The fragments of Antisthenes, and his representation in the works of Xenophon, provide evidence for a development in the discourse of kingship, as the Sophistic discourse of tyranny and happiness encountered Socratic ethics.¹² As a student of Gorgias, and a follower of Socrates, Antisthenes was a transitional figure, bridging the sophistic and Socratic traditions, writing both declamations and dialogues.¹³ However, despite the limited textual evidence, the titles of his works, fragments from them and Xenophon's testimony together suggest a thinker whose work at least documents changes to the discourse of kingship within Athens.

Antisthenes' position as an apparent forerunner of the Cynics has dominated research into him, overshadowing his interesting position in his historical context and skewing the reception of his thought.¹⁴ Any reconstruction of Antisthenes' political thought should be tentative, and acknowledge that it relates at least as much to Xenophon's character as to the historical Antisthenes, and relies on later doxographic sources such as Dio Chrysostom's *Orations*.¹⁵ Influential reconstructions of Antisthenes' thought by Dümmmler and Joël pay insufficient attention to these difficulties and miss Antisthenes' focus on the exceptional individual.¹⁶

Some of the characters he discussed as positive exemplars, such as Cyrus and Heracles, operate outside the classical Greek polis, in the larger scale of empire or myth. In this, he both follows Herodotus and precedes the kingship theories of Xenophon and Isocrates. He argued that Cyrus represented the benefits of *ponos* in the barbarian world, while Heracles represented it in the Greek world (DL 6.2 = Fr. 97).¹⁷ Such exemplars demonstrate the positive engagement of Greek political thought with non-Athenian leadership.¹⁸

This makes it difficult to interpret Antisthenes as documenting an alternative account of Socrates' political thought to that given by Plato, as Popper does;

Antisthenes ranges beyond the polis and takes a top-down view of city politics.¹⁹ When Antisthenes engages with Athenian politics, it is to criticise: Athenian demagogues in his *Politicus*, which according to Athenaeus contains ‘abuse of all the demagogues in Athens’ (Fr. 204 = Athen. 220d; the dialogue title is not attested elsewhere), and the Athenian claim to autochthony (Fr. 8, DL 6.1), which as the previous chapter showed was central to Athenian identity. Archelaus of Macedon may have provided a further exemplar, although little is known of Antisthenes’ *Archelaus* other than that it criticised Gorgias (Fr. 203 = Athen. 5.220d), perhaps providing a link to Plato’s *Gorgias*.²⁰

For Antisthenes, Cyrus embodies good rule outside the polis context; he is the subject of several works from which small fragments survive, including sayings on attributes of kingship.²¹ These emphasise paradoxes of rule.

Antisthenes’ Fragment 86 (= Epictetus *Discourses* 4.6.20) consists of a maxim spoken to Cyrus that ‘it is kingly (*basilikon*) to act well but have a bad reputation’ (βασιλικὸν εὖ μὲν πράττειν, κακῶς δὲ ἀκούειν). This suggests that the quality of the king’s actions is significant, but at the same time that good or virtuous action by a ruler may not be perceived as such by all (so that the virtue of a king may be relativised according to perspective of ruler and ruled), as well as the perhaps more pragmatic interpretation that a bad reputation, in the sense of a reputation for taking powerful or forceful action, may in itself be a useful tool for the ruler.²² Fragment 87 argues that the most necessary lesson (μάθημα) for a king was to ‘unlearn (ἀπομαθεῖν) that which is bad’.²³ This time, Cyrus himself is represented as an authoritative source of advice through the possession of knowledge. The idea that the bad can be ‘unlearned’ mirrors the view that virtue is teachable (διδακτὴν) (Fr. 99), itself an important Socratic theme.²⁴

These fragments suggest a distinctive view of the role of the good king. While Herodotus emphasises the importance of perception to kingship, as in the network of spies established by Deioces, Antisthenes takes a more interiorising view of the qualities of a good king – the important aspect is dissemination of his virtuous acts, not information-gathering.

Diogenes Laertius elaborates Antisthenes’ views on political judgement and virtue: then he said that cities are destroyed, whenever ‘they cannot distinguish the worthless (*phaulous*) from the good (*spoudaiōn*)’ (μὴ δύνωνται τοὺς φαύλους ἀπὸ τῶν σπουδαίων διακρίνειν, DL 6.5 = Fr. 71). Here the polis rather than the ruler exercises judgement. He is also represented as arguing against written law: ‘the wise man (*ton sophon*) should participate in politics not in accordance with the established laws but in accordance with the law of virtue’ (Fr. 134.7–8 = DL 6.11).²⁵ The connections between Antisthenes’ fragments on Cyrus and other sayings attributed to him on virtue suggest that his political theory used Cyrus as an exemplar of virtuous character. While this resembles Isocrates’ and Xenophon’s arguments for virtue monarchy, they would equate good kingship and leadership with respect for the law.

It is not clear how positive Antisthenes’ representation of Cyrus was. If Caizzi is correct to connect Antisthenes’ Cyrus and his Alcibiades, the comparison between the two becomes problematic; Fr. 141 (= Herodicus ap. Athen. 5.220c) suggests

that Antisthenes' Cyrus works criticised Alcibiades, describing his incestuous interest in his female relatives as 'like the Persians' (ὡς Πέρσας).²⁶ The critique of Alcibiades' moral choices and behaviour points to discussion of the ethics of rulers, but does not seem to represent Persians positively.²⁷ But that a sophistic critic influenced by Socrates might draw a contrast between Athenian democratic leaders and heroic kings seems plausible, and the association of the Cyrus fragments with Alcibiades would support that.

The surviving declamations on the Homeric heroes Ajax and Odysseus point to Antisthenes' interest in Homeric exemplars of Greek leadership, but he was also interested in other Homeric societies. Antisthenes argued that, because the ground provides produce for the Cyclopes without agriculture, they live in a golden age and must be just (Fr. 189.7–14 = Porphyr. schol. ad *Od* IX.106).²⁸ This interest in the justice of primitive societies would be reflected by Plato in his developmental account of the polis (*Republic* II) and responses to golden-age myths (*Statesman*, *Laws*).

However, like other Socratics Antisthenes, or at least Xenophon's version of him, criticised the educative pretensions of rhapsodes (Xen. *Smp* 3.5–6 = Fr. 185). When Niceratus proudly reports that his knowledge is based on memorising the complete works of Homer, Antisthenes observes that rhapsodes make the same claim, and tartly asks whether Niceratus knows any more foolish men.²⁹ He questions whether knowledge of Homer's praise of Agamemnon is sufficient to impart the skills of kingship: 'Do you know . . . how to rule as a king (*basileuein*/βασιλεύειν)?' (Xen. *Smp*. 4.6 = Fr. 186). Niceratus has offered a conventional catalogue of leadership skills, of 'household management, public speaking or generalship', and four Homeric leaders who possessed them. Antisthenes' rejection of this model, while clearly owing much to Xenophon's own response to the Platonic Socrates' ideas, reinforces the view that both Plato and Xenophon were developing ideas about kingship in the wake of Antisthenes and others.

Antisthenes demonstrated an oppositional stance to Athenian ideology in his frequent invocation of Heracles, identified by Höistad as a 'Cynic "saint"', as a heroic exemplar; his enthusiasm may have been driven by the presence of a sanctuary of Heracles close to the Cynosarges gymnasium.³⁰ Heracles has a complex position in the discourse of Athenian democracy, and using him as a political exemplar is potentially an anti-democratic move in a discourse in which Theseus was positioned as the ideal king and super-citizen.³¹ He was also much represented in comedy. In tragedy, his representation changed over time; he was someone who came to Athens from the outside in order to seek help, and also provided it to Theseus, but later there was also an emphasis on his suffering.³² In the sophistic tradition, Heracles was a well-established character in such narratives as Prodicus' 'Choice of Heracles' (Xen. *Mem*. 2.1.21–34).³³ By using Heracles as a positive exemplar, thinkers such as Antisthenes positioned themselves in opposition to the Athenian orthodoxy seen in tragic representations of him. Heracles is thus linked with Antisthenes' ambiguous status in relation to the political life of Athens.

Cynic sources cited by Diogenes Laertius connect Antisthenes' work on Heracles with thought on the 'virtuous life' (τὸ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν, Fr. 98), and the

teachability of virtue (Fr. 99). The difficulty of achieving virtue and the steps one might have to take appear to be analysed through a mythical logos on the education of Heracles. He seeks out Chiron the centaur through *eros* (Frs. 92, 99) and studies with him; in another episode, Prometheus lectures him on the virtuous life (Fr. 96).³⁴ In this perspective, Heracles represents an ideal life similar to that of Socrates, a view that also surfaces in Plato's *Euthydemus* and Xenophon's Socratic writings.³⁵

The later Cynic tradition differed from conventional views on monarchy, in being focused on the individual's rule over himself and his appetites, rather than on relationships between ruler and ruled in traditional political structures.³⁶ But analogy between the rule of one part of the individual over others and one part of the city over the others is also a feature of Plato's *Republic*, and Xenophon develops similar views on self-control in his analysis of kingship. However, the conventionality of Antisthenes' statements on kingship, in relation to Cyrus, suggest that he did not fully prefigure the Cynic vision of Heracles as the exemplary self-ruling cosmopolitan citizen-king.

Antisthenes' fragments suggest that the discussions of early Socratics covered kingship, potential exemplars of good kingship, and the relationship between kingship, knowledge and virtue, and that they ranged far beyond Athens. Where these ideas can be seen in a more developed form, as well as in something closer to their original context, is in the Socratic works of Xenophon.

Xenophon's account of the 'kingly art'

Xenophon's Socratic works set his version of Socrates among friendly and rival educators, students and other individuals of varying status encountered in Athens, providing evidence for intellectual life within Socratic circles, with a characteristically Xenophontic stress on issues of leadership within the household and beyond.³⁷ The relationship between individual and city is central to Xenophon's political thought in the *Memorabilia*; in particular, control over the self must precede control over others.³⁸ The conceptualisation of the interrelationship of government of self and of others, through the concept of *sōphrosunē* (prudence and temperance), provides a space in which Xenophon can explore ideas that in less practically oriented writers might more easily be recognised as explorations of social and political ontology.

Like Plato, Xenophon identifies the good ruler's skill set as a *technē*, often qualified with an adjective specifying the domain over which the expertise is exercised, the military (*stratēgikē*) or the household (*oikonomikē*). Both Plato and Xenophon depict Socrates discussing *basilikē technē*, the 'kingly art' set above or controlling all others, and both imply that the concept was contested, although the nature of objections to the political use of the craft analogy, of which the craft of kingship is a specific and important example, becomes clearer in Xenophon's account.³⁹ Xenophon sets Socrates' views against objections from other characters, who present robust cases for different positions, such as that offered by Aristippus in *Memorabilia* 2.1. *Basilikē technē* plays an important role in Plato's political thought, but

its somewhat casual introduction in the *Euthydemus* suggests that he is joining an existing discussion; the pairing of discussion of *basilikē technē* and of contrasting educational methods also suggests that a familiar debate.⁴⁰ Xenophon, too, appears to assume that readers will be familiar with *basilikē technē* as a concept that different speakers will use in different ways. It is impossible to attribute the origination of the concept to either Xenophon or Plato, in the same way that the *topos* of rhapsodes' foolishness is used but not invented by both authors.⁴¹

Gregory Vlastos attempted to disprove the historicity of the Xenophontic Socrates by demonstrating a distinction between the two authors' concepts of *basilikē technē*, but his account, which posits a strong divide between an ethical concept (Plato) and a political concept (Xenophon), overstates any dissimilarity and understates Xenophon's ethical concerns.⁴² Vlastos' distinction has been much criticised by subsequent scholars, who have argued that Xenophon's *basilikē technē* is both an ethical and a political concept.⁴³ It connects the soul of the ruler to the bodies of the ruled, with the former dictating the punishment of the latter (2.1.16), and explains the distinction that Xenophon draws between kingship and tyranny.⁴⁴ This distinction has been disputed by followers of Strauss, who read the description of *basilikē technē* (*Mem.* 2.1.10–17) as evidence that Xenophon used irony to promote tyranny rather than kingship as a form of rule.

The clustering of debate around *basilikē technē* emphasises its centrality to Xenophon's political thought, and the importance of interpreting what Xenophon means by *basilikē* through its context in the discourse of kingship. Understanding the context of the discussion of kingship within Xenophon's Socratic works, and their position in debates on kingship within Athenian intellectual culture, can help to identify it as an important positive concept for Xenophon, just as tyranny is a negative one.

The discourse of kingship in Xenophon's Socratic works

Xenophon's exploration of kingship uses similar exemplars of the virtuous individual and leader to those associated with Antisthenes' thought, including Hercules, emphasising an ethical dimension to leadership, and Cyrus, offering a more political perspective. His Socrates presents a (largely) consistent set of interlinked values that the individual capable of good leadership and rule in various contexts exemplifies; this *basilikē technē* operates over different levels of ruling, so its possessor also has the key subsidiary skills that may be shared with other specialists, often displaying these sequentially prior to acquiring the full-blown *technē* of kingship.⁴⁵ Those with *basilikē technē* may have 'sufficient expertise in governing self, home, city and army', and therefore be 'advantageous to themselves and others' (πολιτικοὶ γίνονται καὶ οἰκονομικοὶ καὶ ἄρχειν ἱκανοὶ καὶ ὠφέλιμοι τοῖς τε ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἑαυτοῖς, *Mem.* 4.2.11); they can act capably in all matters relating to ruling.⁴⁶ Xenophon here depicts his Socrates espousing a view similar to that of his Antisthenes, in regarding the overall skill of the king (exemplified by Agamemnon) as superior to the specialist arts of managing specific domains (the other Greek leaders) and as a distinctive form of knowledge (Xen. *Smp.* 4.6).

If there is a gap between the leadership skill of a general (or other managerial figure) and that of *basilikē technē*, recognising it and explaining the relationship between the two levels in terms of quantity or quality will be important, a project that Plato identifies in his *Euthydemus* and further addresses in the *Statesman*.

Xenophon's use of kingship terminology outside the context of the craft analogy is helpful in understanding the value he places upon it. Some insight into what he means by *basileus* and *basilikos* appears in *Mem.* 3.9.10–11, part of a sequence in which Socrates defines terms in response to anonymous questioners.⁴⁷ This section follows the discussion of practical questions of leadership in the context of Athenian democracy (3.1–7) and the education of young leaders such as Pericles junior, Glaucon and Charmides; a further discussion with the Socratic Aristippus of Cyrene serves as a frame (3.8).⁴⁸ Within these chapters the mythical kings of Athens serve as exemplary models, through their performance of the great deeds of the city (3.5.10). These kings offer Xenophon's best illustration of elite public service through good leadership.⁴⁹

In this series of definitions, 'kings and rulers' are those who 'know how to rule' (τοὺς ἐπισταμένους ἄρχειν), not those who hold sceptres, or are simply chosen, selected by lot or acquire power through force or deception (3.9.10). Possessing knowledge (*epistamenous*) is emphasised over the more general 'capability to act in pursuit of advantage' (ικανοὶ καὶ ὠφέλιμοι) identified in 4.2.11. Kings are here distinguished from the lot-selected archons of Athens, but not exempted from the requirement of knowledge. The idea that the craft of ruling is a qualitatively different form of knowledge, as argued by Plato in the *Republic* and elsewhere, is here acknowledged by Xenophon. But the implications of it being a specifically kingly art are expanded by Xenophon, for whom the adjective is more than a metaphorical indication of high status or control.

More generally, Xenophon applies the adjective *basilikos* to a range of moral and political goods to identify those which he regards as the best.⁵⁰ So, as we shall see below, *basilikoi nomoi* are the best kinds of laws (*Oec.* 14.6, 14.7), and *basilikon ēthos* the best kind of character (*Oec.* 21.11). While Xenophon identifies the holders of top levels of hierarchies as *basilikon*, it is not simply their position but the way in which that position is held that is significant.

Because law is central to Xenophon's political thinking, the relationship between king and law must be expected to be something that will preoccupy him. The discussion in *Mem.* 4.2, and the broader progression of Euthydemus' education in 4.2–6, show the presence of law to be important for justice. It is also the determining factor for separating out kingship from tyranny (4.6.12). In the *Memorabilia* this is briefly defined in terms of willingness of subjects and accordance with law (*Mem.* 4.6.12), in line with the typology presented in Plato's *Statesman*. The presence of law and the assent of the subjects to rule are both required to identify a single ruler as a king rather than tyrant.⁵¹ The emphasis on the role of law in Xenophon and other Athenian political theorists contrasts with that of Antisthenes (134.7–8 = DL 6.11), who argues that the wise man should be guided by individual virtue over communal law in his political interactions.⁵² But the opposition between tyranny and law is made clear in the closing sections of the

Anonymus Iamblichi (6.1, 7.1–7, 8.12); theorists took up differing positions in this continuing debate.

Xenophon goes on to explore the relationship between rule further in his *Cyropaedia*, where Cyrus is reported to say that ‘the good ruler is a seeing law’ (τὸν δὲ ἀγαθὸν ἄρχοντα βλέποντα νόμον, *Cyr.* 8.1.22); there is no distinction between king and law in this ideal case. This brief definition seems to have a different focus from the discussions of *basilikē technē* where the capacity of the leader is the main concern.

But Xenophon’s attempts to separate kingship and tyranny, and to explore the tension between them, have not prevented the development of readings of his political thought that treat discussion of kingship as masking a deeper discourse, one in which talk of kingship and excellence masks the underlying analysis of power. In such readings, originating with Leo Strauss’ analysis of the *Memorabilia*, praise of kings for virtue or skill is read as ironic, and *basilikē technē* becomes another name for tyranny.⁵³

The craft of kingship in the *Memorabilia*

The concept *basilikē technē* is introduced in two important, and atypically lengthy, dialogues in the *Memorabilia*, conversations between Socrates and Aristippus (2.1) and Socrates and a potential student, Euthydemus (4.2).⁵⁴ These conversations, and Aristippus himself and the hedonistic values he represents, play an important structural role in the *Memorabilia*, in which the necessity of political participation and the assumption of personal responsibility for political action are key themes.⁵⁵

Xenophon ends the introductory chapter 1.2 by concluding that Socrates offered training in ‘the finest and most magnificent virtue’ (καλλίστης καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτης ἀρετῆς, 1.2.64); Louis-André Dorion points out that the skill identified as *basilikē technē* at 4.2.11 is similarly described, although there is a distinction to be made between ‘most splendid’ (μεγαλοπρεπεστάτης, 4.2.11), which implies that the quality is particularly fitted to its bearer, and ‘greatest’ (μεγίστης, 4.2.11), which is more absolute.⁵⁶ Dorion downplays the significance of kingship within Xenophon’s political thought, arguing that Xenophon’s use of *basilikē* in the *Memorabilia* is a metaphorical usage, to describe the position of the *technē* as that exercised by any kind of leader, and does not imply that *basilikē technē* is a specific quality of actual ruling kings, but is rather ‘la compétence politique du bon dirigeant’.⁵⁷

This underplays the significance of kingship in Xenophon’s political thought, in which kingship takes on a metaphysical status, and is not simply a metaphor for a hierarchical relationship, but a cluster of differentiating qualities that separate ruler and ruled as distinct entities in his political ontology. These ethical and practical qualities, which enable a man to display and develop *basilikē technē*, are precisely and best exemplified by good kings such as Agesilaus or Cyrus.⁵⁸ The highly specific way in which such kings succeed in leadership endeavours, distinct from success at generalship or peace-time rule, is given great significance.⁵⁹ Xenophon, in exploring political structures beyond the world of the polis, where

the term *basileus* is applied to certain religious offices in a limited sense, envisages both the warrior king and leader of the Homeric and heroic world, and the very real *basileus* of *ethnos* states such as Persia. His prime example of kingship, Cyrus the elder, clearly operates in a non-metaphorical, non-polis space, but Xenophon does occasionally assimilate the Persian court or even wider communities to a polis.⁶⁰ Although these represent an idealised version of single-person rule, they do so in structures which cannot be fully assimilated to the participatory structures of the Athenian polis.⁶¹

Simply identifying Xenophon's use of *basilikē* as a metaphor for leadership more generally limits the political claim he makes that the best kind of leadership is that exercised by the king, and fails to explore the views he holds about kingship that underlie the metaphor and make it work. The framework within which Xenophon treats anything identified as *basilikos* as superior and equipped to rule well depends on his underlying belief that kingship, when instanced in certain individuals, exhibits those qualities. The surplus meaning of the concept of kingship ensures that it takes over anything analogised to it; when a good leader exhibits *basilikē technē* he instantiates a wide range of positive moral and intellectual qualities that are key components of virtue.⁶² Invoking kingship makes a specific claim about the relationship between the holder of those virtues and others.

Aristippus, not Socrates, first introduces the expression *basilikē technē*, concluding a negative characterisation of Socratic education and its goals (*Mem.* 2.1).⁶³ He uses the term to describe the Socratic educational package, which promotes the values of the polis and political participation that he rejects (*Mem.* 2.1.17).⁶⁴ Some scholars have claimed that the package that Aristippus identifies as *basilikē technē* entails Socratic support for what Johnson calls 'nasty politics', a kind of *realpolitik* in which domination is the only alternative to slavery for both individuals and *poleis*.⁶⁵ Others have shown that the central political argument (2.1.10–17) confirms Socrates' (and so Xenophon's) commitment to the collective life of the polis.⁶⁶ Johnson shows that Xenophon uses the dialogue form to examine Aristippus' approach critically; Socrates uses Aristippus' framework to present the consequences of Aristippus' non-participation and rejection of *ponos*, but presents his positive case within the fable of Heracles. This has been paralleled with Socrates' refutation of Callicles in Plato's *Gorgias*, also ending with a myth, where Platonic *politikē technē* serves the function that *basilikē technē* might do in this argument.⁶⁷

The discussion opens with a thought-experiment into how one might identify the forms of education that would equip one young man to 'be capable of ruling' (ὅπως ἱκανὸς ἔσται ἄρχειν), and another 'that he might not seek out' rule (ὅπως μὴδ' ἀντιποιήσεται ἀρχῆς, 2.1.1).⁶⁸ The purpose of the discussion is to explain the importance of *enkrateia*, bodily self-control, a key human attribute and precursor to virtue for Xenophon's Socrates, or the desire to develop that quality, and to instil it in the undisciplined Aristippus. Is the ability to control various physical desires (for food, rest, sex and so on) useful for those who must lead others? The discussion begins with the individual's control of his body (2.1.2–5), but the context is the application of *enkrateia* in collective life; developing the capacity to resist hunger or exhaustion is useful for the tough environment of military campaigns.⁶⁹

It also has parallels with the development of mental self-control, *sōphrosunē*. Control over the lower appetites should precede control over and moderation of the higher parts of the soul.

Aristippus' argument is that his rejection of collective life permits him to reject *enkrateia* as a value. He rejects the value that Socrates assigns to leadership, regarding the position of the ruler in the polis as the opposite – 'Cities think it right to treat their rulers just as I treat my household slaves' (καὶ γὰρ ἀξιοῦσιν αἱ πόλεις τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ὥσπερ ἐγὼ τοῖς οἰκέταις χρῆσθαι, 2.1.9). Aristippus believes that the opposition of ruler and ruled, or 'ruling and enslavement' (δι' ἀρχῆς . . . διὰ δουλείας), within the polis is non-exhaustive and that a third choice is available; the 'freedom' (δι' ἐλευθερίας) of life outside polis structures will enable him to flourish (πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν, 2.1.11). Socrates firmly rejects this perspective; he cannot envisage a human life which does not involve interaction with others, and if there is interaction outside the framework of society there will be the opposition between ruling and being ruled, which the stronger will win. He describes a state of nature in which the stronger will seize or destroy the crops of the weaker, until they are terrorised into 'choosing the slavery' of domination (ἐλέσθαι δουλεύειν, 2.1.12–13); this is the basis of interpretations that present Xenophon as an ironic proponent of tyranny.⁷⁰

Aristippus claimed exemption from learning the skills needed for public life because he has withdrawn from it: he claims 'I do not restrict myself within a polit-eia, but am a foreigner-guest everywhere' (οὐδ' εἰς πολιτείαν ἐμᾶντὸν κατακλείω, ἀλλὰ ξένος πανταχοῦ εἰμι, 2.1.13). Socrates explores the political consequences of this choice. He argues that those on the road outside the city, lacking the protection of the polis, are those most in danger of suffering injustice, citing Sinis and Procrustes as (mythical) examples of those who harmed strangers on the road.⁷¹ Socrates then returns to the context of the household within the polis, in which he depicts Aristippus as an idle slave, a burden who will be severely disciplined for his failure to contribute (2.1.16). Outside the city, Aristippus would be at risk; inside the city, his failure to contribute through *ponos* marks him out for punishment. The dialogic context of this argument, addressed directly to Aristippus' claim that freedom from political obligation is possible, means that it cannot be used (as Aristippus will attempt at 2.1.17) as a summary of the political views of Xenophon's Socrates. Johnson suggests that the zero-sum master–slave competitive politics outlined by Socrates here echo those of Plato's Callicles, and would only truly be in play here if Socrates were to endorse that model of politics rather than his own distinctive one.⁷²

Aristippus suggests that Socrates identifies *eudaimonia* and *basilikē technē* as outcomes of the education that he provides (2.1.17). This suggests that the *eudaimonia* arises from the practice of ruling (or possessing the ruling art) rather than it being the instrument for reaching that goal. Aristippus, on the other hand, regards this education as barely different from the punishment of slaves that Socrates has just outlined, and which he has agreed that he would inflict on his own slaves were they to demonstrate indiscipline. The only difference, for Aristippus, is that willing submission to this discipline marks those submitting to such punishment as fools (2.1.17).

But this is the end of Aristippus' objections. Socrates does not argue directly against the description of his educational programme as *basilikē technē* or its goal of *eudaimonia*; his retelling of the fifth-century sophist Prodicus' story of the Choice of Heracles (2.1.21–33) shows that Xenophon regards the achievement of *eudaimonia* through *ponos* in virtuous activity as a Socratic view.⁷³ He emphasises the distinction between voluntary and involuntary submission to hardship, using hunger as an example (2.1.18); this simple example of how one might develop *enkrateia*, bodily self-control, through practice, leads to a longer exposition of the importance of choosing the virtuous path, expressed through a story about Heracles attributed to the educator Prodicus.

The switch from dialogue to mythical narrative creates the opportunity for Xenophon to expand his earlier claim that '*enkrateia* is the foundation of virtue' (τὴν ἐγκράτειαν ἀρετῆς εἶναι κρηπίδα, 1.5.4). The fable of the choice of Heracles, the famed non-citizen and possessor of outsize physical appetites, further responds to Aristippus' presentation of life outside the polis. Even on the road, outside the city, choosing Virtue will always be beneficial. Within the city, the recollection of 'former deeds' success and services rendered will produce a superior kind of pleasure, as will 'civic honours' (τίμιοι δὲ πατρίσιν, 2.1.33). Politics is not, in the myth, the zero-sum game that a Straussian reading of 2.1.13–15 produces; pleasure and virtue are inextricably connected with public service, labour that is useful and beneficial for both leader and led, producing a network of mutually beneficial relationships that protects all citizens from the state of nature. Given the protreptic function of the myth, Aristippus is not permitted to offer any response, but in true Xenophontic style is encouraged to go away and think about the message of the fable (2.1.33–4).

This message from the fable of Heracles at the crossroads suggests that readings that equate Socratic *basilikē technē* with education for tyranny, or understand Xenophon as a proponent of *realpolitik*, have missed the fable's focus on beneficence that emerges in the fable. Socrates here, as in book III, links the labour of rulers with the collective benefit of the citizenry. Xenophon provides a positive model for political behaviour and leadership through the choices described to Heracles by Virtue, just as in the *Gorgias* Plato's Socrates will first describe his *politikē technē*, then narrate an eschatological myth with its alternative anti-*politeia*.⁷⁴ This initial negative characterisation of *basilikē technē* is balanced by a potentially more positive account presented by Socrates himself.

The term appears in another important dialogic section of the work, which focuses on Socrates' teaching, through his elenctic interactions with a potential student, Euthydemus (4.2), and interrelates with Plato's discussions.⁷⁵ Socrates here identifies *basilikē technē* as an overarching leadership capability that can be exercised in different subsidiary contexts, but in its most complete form is 'the finest virtue' (τῆς καλλίστης ἀρετῆς) and 'greatest craft' (μεγίστης . . . τέχνης, 4.2.11); as we saw earlier, it is the skill through which men become capable leaders, useful to both others and themselves. The idea of usefulness to both self and others is a recurrent feature of Xenophon's thought, which identifies positive skills, as well as parallels between treatment of the self as individual and others as collective

social group.⁷⁶ In doing so, it excludes tyranny; its possessors are *politikoi*, skilled at leadership in the context of the polis; but they possess the further level of being ‘capable of ruling’, ἄρχειν ἱκανοί. While all these leadership skills are subsumed into a single craft, identified as ‘[the skill] of kings’ (ἔστι γὰρ τῶν βασιλέων αὕτη) and ‘called *basilikē technē*’ (4.2.11), the possession of the final stage of ruling capability is significant.

The identification of possessors of this craft with kings is not a straightforward metaphor, in which kingship simply indicates the final and highest value in any series, but one which takes a special form when applied to civic capabilities or responsibilities. The kingly craft is both a *technē* and a virtue, a link that is explored in the ensuing discussion, and as Aristippus hinted in the earlier dialogue on the choice of virtue. Socrates asks Euthydemus whether it is possible to gain the skills Euthydemus seeks (the art of ruling) ‘without being just’ (4.2.11). Euthydemus believes that a grasp of justice is necessary to be a good citizen, but as Socrates is about to show him, determining what is just is more difficult than he realised, and even understanding the extent of his own self-knowledge or lack of it is difficult. Whatever the route to acquiring *basilikē technē*, it will involve Socratic processes of dismantling false perceptions and replacing them with more firmly grounded knowledge. These begin with exploring the inapplicability of the craft analogy to justice, something which does not have end-products in the same way that carpentry does (4.2.12).

The relationship between being *politikos* in the polis and possessing *basilikē technē* as an individual is somewhat underdetermined here, just as in Plato’s *Euthydemus*. Xenophon’s Euthydemus is seeking the skills to enable him to succeed in the political life of a democratic city (4.2.36), but the skill he needs is the kingly art. Although many goods (beauty, fame, strength, wealth) contribute to success in political life, they also carry the risk of corruption and decline (4.2.35). Two potential sources of strength that can cause difficulty for politicians are *doxa* and *politikē dunamis*; many have suffered substantial trouble on their account. It is not clear here what Xenophon means here by *dunamis*; whether he means the possession of power within the polis, or a capacity to exercise political power, the sense in which Aristotle later uses the term (*Pol.* 3.13.1284a7, in a discussion of the supremely virtuous individual).⁷⁷

This relationship between *basilikē technē* and *politikē dunamis* will not be clarified either here or in Plato’s *Euthydemus*; Plato will address this in the *Statesman*. However, the link between kingship and character virtue is introduced in this discussion, despite its lack of a complete resolution. Xenophon shows Socrates leading Euthydemus to *aporia*, but also providing further teaching to help him become as good as possible (4.2.40).

Kingship in the Oeconomicus

The concept of kingship plays an important role within the *Oeconomicus*, as the ideal of good rule, which Socrates first describes to the young Critoboulus, and then explores further in his self-reported dialogue with the Persian-inspired

Athenian gentleman-farmer Ischomachus. The dialogue is concerned with more abstract conceptions of virtue and leadership than the topic of household management might initially suggest.⁷⁸ Xenophon here once more conflates leadership in different contexts, particularly household, city, army, and yet continues to imply a hierarchy of knowledge and practice, in which 'kingly' denotes the most complete and final member of a series of skills. This question of social ontology would continue to exercise Greek theorists, appearing in both Plato's *Statesman* and Aristotle's *Politics*. Here Xenophon's conflation of different types of rule suggests that the metaphorical use of kingship to describe hierarchy is in play, masking the ontological problem.

Luccioni suggests that the *Oeconomicus* is 'un ouvrage de propagande monarchiste' in its depiction of leadership, but the interest lies in the way that monarchical elements are mixed into those more familiar to Athenians.⁷⁹ The question of what exactly an estate manager is the manager of is explored in the initial conversation between Socrates and Critoboulus (chapters 1–6). Here, Socrates is at pains to emphasise that the king or leader's over-arching command of rule encompasses mastery of some constituent tasks, and oversight through intermediaries of others, so that the good leader himself participates in decision-making and implementation in the latter areas, notably agriculture and the arts of war (*Oec.* 4.4).⁸⁰ Socrates illustrates this with the story of the Spartan commander Lysander's surprise at discovering that Cyrus the Younger planning his gardens and planting the trees himself (4.20–5). However, while Xenophon shows that kingly rule can extend down into subordinate tasks, he is less clear about the nature of the entity that results from kingly rule, or the consequences of kingly rule for those of non-slave status who are subject to it, a series of problems that Aristotle will explore. While Xenophon seeks to encourage kingly qualities in Athenian gentlemen, he does not go so far as to suggest that they should operate within Athens as kings.

The discussion between Socrates and Ischomachus (chapters 7–21) covers a wide range of aspects of household and estate management, but the topic of training staff to take on management responsibilities brings out the link between leadership and kingship that both Socrates and Ischomachus posit (13–14). Ischomachus is reluctant to reveal his training methods, which he regards as so simple and obvious that Socrates 'will laugh' (καταγελάσαις, 13.4) when he hears them.⁸¹ But Socrates does not think that this is a ridiculous topic; whoever can make a man 'capable of domestic mastery' (δεσποτικούς, 13.5) also has the capacity to make a man 'kingly' (βασιλικούς), showing that the art of kingship is teachable.⁸² Nothing could state more strongly that Socrates regards this as a serious matter, and a capability worthy of the highest praise. Xenophon thus, like Plato, conflates the rule of household and larger political entities.

In the next chapter, Ischomachus expands on the precepts by which he teaches and rules, revealing more of the characteristics he regards as 'kingly'. He introduces the idea of 'kingly laws' (14.6–7), when he explains to Socrates how he encourages good behaviour and honesty in the farmworkers. This discussion of discipline within the household shows Xenophon treating the private estate as a miniature political entity, whether polis or kingdom. Ischomachus takes the laws

of his private kingdom from both domains; at 14.4 he expresses enthusiasm for the laws of Draco and Solon (pre-democratic laws acceptable to the proponents of ancestral constitution versions of Athens), which provide a deterrent in their punishment of wrongdoers. But he finds it useful to add some laws taken from the kings of Persia: ‘the king’s laws (*basilikoi nomoi*) not only punish the unjust but also benefit the just’ (οἱ δὲ βασιλικοὶ νόμοι οὐ μόνον ζημιοῦσι τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὠφελοῦσι τοὺς δικαίους, 14.7). Here *basilikos* does double duty, both in referring to the *basileus*, king of Persia, but also in describing the special quality of these laws, a quality that ensures their authority. Xenophon’s specific contribution is to create, within Ischomachus’ household, a mixture of Greek and non-Greek forms of rule.⁸³

Ischomachus’ final summary of his worldview centres on the concept of a ‘kingly character’ or *ethos*, ἥθους βασιλικοῦ (21.10). This quality enables men to display good leadership in various situations; the chapter runs through a ship-of-state image (21.3), a comparison with military life (5–7), and finally turns to government. In contrast with his earlier assertion that leadership capabilities could be taught, it now seems that the *ethos* that equips a man to govern is innate, even if it requires training to develop and bring into use (21.10–11).⁸⁴ Ischomachus uses *basilikos* to identify the underlying quality that unites different fields of leadership skill, the ruling principle of farming, politics, estate management and military tactics (21.2). This suggests a monarchical model of excellence underlying Xenophon’s political thought and views on leadership.⁸⁵

Xenophon’s focus on the ethical qualities of leadership shows that Vlastos’ distinction between Plato’s *basilikē technē* as ethical and Xenophon’s as political is incorrect. That *basilikē technē* serves as a master craft of ruling is fundamental both to Xenophon’s arguments in *Memorabilia* and to Plato’s in *Gorgias* and *Euthydemus*, and the concept is assumed and accepted by both writers, without being clearly identified. Whether knowledge of *basilikē technē* requires knowledge of subsidiary arts, or of some entirely separate form of knowledge, remains unclear in both writers; both return to the topic.

While Xenophon’s version of the skill has a more practical orientation and interest in the short-term goals identified by the *ōphelos* than its Platonic counterpart, it also has a strong ethical component, in line with the political and ethical views that both authors attribute to Socrates; *basilikos* qualities are found in both laws (*nomoi*) and character (*ēthos*).⁸⁶ But Xenophon also seems to lean more heavily on the positive qualities of kingship, relying on its connotations of good cosmic order to separate it from ideas of tyranny, until he can build his model of the virtuous king as the benefactor of his people.

Plato and kingship as a master art

Plato’s critical approach to both the dominant discourse of democracy and the emergent discourse of kingship can be seen in the way his political thought develops, or rather the aspects of his political thought that are emphasised as he confronts a changing political and theoretical landscape, one that is primarily

addressed through written literature rather than the oral discourse of the assembly and the courts.⁸⁷

Plato's philosopher kings might be the best-known invocation of monarchy in Greek thought, but the function that monarchy plays in Plato's political thought is complex. The difficulty arises at least in part because Plato uses the language of kingship both to describe actual or ideal political arrangements, and in what at first appears to be a more metaphorical sense to describe a specific form of skill or knowledge that is set over all other forms of skill. When Plato presents Socrates identifying the third wave of his shocking political argument (*Rep.* 5.473c7–8) with the claim that there will be no end to human troubles until the true philosophers rule as kings or those presently called kings become philosophers (473c10–d6), he draws together two elements conventionally separated (473d4), identifying *philosophia* as supplying the only effective form of *politikē dunamis* (473d3).

This opens the question of whether Socrates' claim here should be read in the light of Socrates' assertion that political *technē* and kingly *technē* are the same thing (*Euthydemus* 291c4–5), albeit something that is difficult to define. But Socrates does not identify philosophy directly with the kingly art, which such a reading of the *Republic's* third wave would imply. While the *Republic's* central books explore what *philosophia* entails, and the process by which one might become a philosopher, they do not explore the nature of the kingly art; kings may provide the starting point from which decline produces other defective constitutions (6.502a4–b1), but Plato's attention turns to the possibilities that open up when decline fails to occur (502b3–c7).⁸⁸ As a result, while Plato's exploration of what he means by a philosopher has received a great deal of attention, drawing on the *Republic's* subsequent detailed exploration of knowledge and education, the way in which his model of kingship provides a critique of the existing discourse of kingship within Greek and especially Athenian culture has received less attention. Plato's search for the arts of politics and kingship is carried out in the *Gorgias* and *Euthydemus*, although it remains aporetic until the restatement of his political ideas in the *Statesman*.

The dramatic setting of the *Gorgias* (as with the *Protagoras*), in which Socrates encounters visiting teachers and through them the views of their students, points firmly to the late fifth-century milieu of the eponymous sophists and their interactions with Athenian democracy, and contains some of the most explicit pronouncements on Athenian politics that Plato gives to Socrates, culminating in the final critique of Athenian politics (*Grg.* 518e–519d), that leads to the eschatological myth in which all human judgement is questioned (523a–527a).⁸⁹ While participants in the *Gorgias* can debate the legacy of Pericles, there is still a sense of confidence in Athenian democracy and its politicians, at least on the part of Socrates' interlocutors, and a focus on Athenian genres of public discourse.⁹⁰

The interlocutor who introduces the model of tyranny to the dialogue is not Gorgias himself but his student Polus, who presents the sophistic conception of the tyrant as the happiest of men (470c9–d9), a version of the *adikos eudaimōn* topos.⁹¹ Polus notes that there is no need to turn to 'ancient examples' (παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν, 470c9–d1) to support his argument, because of the availability of contemporary

references.⁹² Both his examples, Archelaus of Macedon (470d5–6) and the Great King of Persia (470e4), are those used by Antisthenes.⁹³ While Socrates pointedly disclaims knowledge of Archelaus (470d9), he cannot disclaim broad knowledge of Persian kings, but can dispute that such a king could be happy, unless he was educated in justice (470e6–7).⁹⁴

Socrates continues to criticise both the Athenian politicians introduced by Gorgias (Pericles and Themistocles, 455e2–3), and the tyrants introduced by Polus. The conventional politics in which politicians and demos are locked into an unproductive relationship of flattery and domination provides one pole of the opposition, while the new *politikē technē* of Socrates provides the other.

Socrates' mechanism for exploring the political capabilities of different individuals is to use his craft analogy, as if the goods produced by political action were analogous to those produced by other crafts practised within the city.⁹⁵ Kingship enters this discussion as a way both of describing the craft of rule and of describing its relationship to other crafts, a double function that may be exploited by Plato, as it is by Xenophon. Socrates differentiates crafts into two types, those that serve the body and those that serve the soul (464b3–4), and positions *politikē technē* as the top level craft that serves the soul, set over the arts of law-giving and justice.⁹⁶ There is no equivalent over-arching craft for service to the body (464b4–6), a lack of equivalence which might suggest that the analogy will run into difficulties when it comes to exploring the relationship between top-level and subordinate crafts, the precise point of difficulty in the political application of the craft analogy.

This model responds to an opposing position, that there is no master political craft, but a skill shared by all humans, which Plato attributes to Protagoras (*Prt.* 320c–322d).⁹⁷ There is no superordinate *technē* that is the preserve of the few in Protagoras' model; Plato's model, on the other hand, will focus on defining and locating the special, elite *technē* or *epistēmē* of politics, and on identifying its practitioners.

Socrates' 'political craft'

Socrates' mixes his final refutation of Callicles with a rhetorical assault on Athenian democratic leaders (*Grg.* 515d–519b). In this discussion, he dismisses the politicians instanced earlier in the dialogue, arguing that none of them is a true exponent of his political art; the distinctive political practices of Socrates and Callicles are identifiable by their intended products, better citizens in the case of Socrates, and happier citizens in the case of Callicles (503a, 521a).

Using the craft analogy Socrates identifies the skills of medicine and physical training as 'mistresses' (δεσποίνας, 518a4) over other more lowly skills that serve the body.⁹⁸ Some details of the analogous *politikē technē*, of which he is 'the only current practitioner' (πράττειν τὰ πολιτικά μόνος τῶν νῦν, 521d6–8) are developed, presenting it as analogous to single-person rule in a form radically different from the way such rule is normally conceptualised in Athenian debate, a new form of political practice quite distinct from the well-established exploration of tyranny. In this new form of politics, Socrates benefits the citizens by making

them better, however unpleasant a process that might be for them. This makes obvious the difficulties in putting the Socratic political art into practice: Socrates depicts himself as a doctor, being prosecuted by a sweet-maker in front of a jury of children (521e3–522a7). When the purveyor of sweets reminds them of the bitter medicine prescribed by the doctor, they are happy to convict him.⁹⁹

Dodds suggests that Socrates' argument in this passage 'foresees the philosopher-king solution'; Plato both presents Socrates as a potential philosopher king, and shows how the philosopher's contributions are rejected by the masses.¹⁰⁰ It is not clear that a Platonic philosopher king could prevail in Athens without adopting the attributes and rhetoric of ordinary politicians, as the image of the Cave suggests.¹⁰¹ The difference between Platonic philosophers and other rulers, in the *Republic's* model, is that philosophers' great quality is their 'contemplation of being rather than becoming' (θεωρία παντὸς μὲν χρόνον, πάσης δὲ οὐσίας, *Rep.* 6.486a8–10), and their love of truth (485c3–4) and disdain for money (485e3–5). While Socrates' political skill involves the disregard of matters conventionally thought important (such as money), and so matches that of the *Republic's* philosophers, he does not have their positive programme. Socrates may regard himself as possessing a special expertise, but he has no way to actualise it without endangering himself (521c7–d3). His *politikē technē* does not have the status of the *basilikoi nomoi* of Xenophon's Persian king, already being in place at the top of a hierarchy.

The dialogue's concluding myth (523a–524a) provides a further alternative to contemporary political practice, better aligned with Socrates' *politikē technē*, compared with the Athenian structure in which Socrates will struggle (522b3–c3). It creates a judicial structure for the assessment of the souls of the dead, which replaces human political practice, delivering a kind of 'anti-politics' or 'anti-constitution' based on the superior knowledge and judgement of divine judges; as Richard Stalley argues, within the myth 'no earthly rulers and no earthly court can be of much value'.¹⁰² But Socrates, on the other hand, expects this court to judge him more accurately than that of Athens' will, and, if his political practice is correct, to send him to the Islands of the Blessed (526c1–5).

Reading the myth as a dialogue with the earlier parts of the *Gorgias*, as David Sedley does, reveals a sharp critique of Athenian practice, where dikasts are regularly deceived by the outward appearance of speakers, just like the living judges of the newly dead in the Age of Cronus.¹⁰³ Zeus replaces these judges with semi-divine founder kings Minos, Rhadamanthys and Aeacus (523e6–524a1), generating a system in which the dead are judged correctly, their souls no longer masked by bodies (524d–25a).¹⁰⁴ These judges concur with Socrates, in rejecting tyrants and kings as wicked (524e–525a, 525d), and sending to the Islands of the Blessed those who match Socrates' description of the possessor of true *politikē technē* (526c). Both Archelaus (525d1–2) and the Great King (524e1–2) are singled out as examples of those they punish, providing a final answer to Polus' invocation of them as happy, along with kings and hereditary rulers more generally (524e4, 525e3–4).

While the *Gorgias* myth prefigures Plato's other eschatological myths (*Phd.* 107d5–115a9, *Rep.* 10.614b2–621b7), this version shows the connections between

myth and politics.¹⁰⁵ The contrast between the Age of Cronus and the Age of Zeus, and the political implications of these for human life and the assessment of justice, will feature in further myths (*Statesman*, *Laws* IV, *Timaeus/Critias*).

So the *Gorgias* myth previews the connection between kingship, divinity and knowledge that Plato will investigate in his later dialogues. That good judgement is a feature of the divine rather than the human realm is a significant feature of Plato's eschatology, and also points to the failure of Athenian judgement in the trial of Socrates, clearly alluded to throughout the discussion of Athenian politics that introduces the myth.

But can Socrates' *politikē technē* be connected to the judgements made by Minos and the others? That it produces similar judgements about the same cases – the tyrant Archelaus and the Great King – suggests that Plato is matching Socrates' thought to that of the divine judges, and criticising other thinkers, particularly Athenian juries, for differing from the divine evaluations. While the discussion with Callicles has brought Socrates into close contact with Athenian political ideas and practice, the myth reframes these discussions and places Socrates' political practice within a different context, one where it can withstand comparison with the divine.

However, the assessment of Socratic *politikē technē* in the *Gorgias* remains incomplete. Although Socrates has argued that it is qualitatively different from the craft of other politicians, such as orators, the limited extent of its practice beyond his own life makes this hard to assess. The analogy between his craft and the judgement displayed by Minos and the other judges suggests that Plato intends to show a clear distinction here between the political worlds of Callicles and Socrates, but it is not explained beyond the implicit analogy offered by the myth.

Basilikē technē in the *Euthydemus* and *Republic*

In the *Gorgias* Plato distinguished Socrates' *politikē technē* from that of other political operators, but its details remained unexplored. In the *Euthydemus*, the idea of *politikē technē* as a supervisory craft is clarified when Plato has Socrates identify *politikē technē* with *basilikē technē*. This explicit claim marks a development in Plato's political thought, in which some sort of 'kingship' becomes identified with the positive achievement of an epistemic ideal, a status exemplified by the philosopher kings of the *Republic*.¹⁰⁶ But the precise nature of this combined *technē* and its product remains elusive to the participants in the discussion Socrates reports, leaving many important aspects of the superordinate *technē* unexplored, as well as the consequences of recognising it within political structures.

The *Euthydemus* makes further steps in this inquiry, but its complex and puzzling presentation, and the fallacies and *aporiai* presented by its protagonists, have led scholars to set it to one side. But it offers a helpful insights into other Platonic dialogues, especially the *Republic*, and into Plato's positioning of his contributions to the discourse of kingship. Its parodic and comic elements suggest that it offers a return to the themes of key dialogues such as the *Republic* rather than a first encounter with them.¹⁰⁷ While it has often been regarded as an early dialogue, its

protreptic and political concerns are shared with Plato's later dialogues, including the *Sophist* and the *Statesman*, and other parts are in dialogue with the *Meno* and the *Republic*.¹⁰⁸ It has also been seen as a response to Antisthenes' thought on the impossibility of contradiction, although only one of its fallacies, on the impossibility of false statement (285d), can be securely linked to him.¹⁰⁹ The challenges to Socrates' narration made by Crito at 290e1, as the frame dialogue returns to interrupt the narration, directly invoke the *Republic*, and demonstrate that the idea of the 'kingly art', also shared with Antisthenes, is in play.¹¹⁰

In both the *Euthydemus* and the *Republic*, the mention of kingship marks an important turning point. This is signalled both by imagery, some shared by both dialogues, and by explicit comment, such as Crito's interruption. Socrates in the *Republic*, once he has introduced his 'third and greatest wave' (τῷ μεγίστῳ . . . κύματι, 5.473c5–6), the suggestion that philosophers might rule as kings, or those called kings rule as philosophers, turns to an exploration of the knowledge that identifies philosophers as philosophers. Socrates in the *Euthydemus* calls upon the sophists, as the Dioscuri, protectors of sailors, to save him from the 'triple-wave of argument' (τῆς τρικυμίας τοῦ λόγου, 293a3) and help him complete his search for the knowledge that makes people flourish (εὐδαιμόνας, 293a5), which he believes to be the *basilikē technē* that he has unsuccessfully searched for with Cleinias.

The scholarly question is whether the *Republic* provides the solution to the *Euthydemus*. On one reading, by Richard Parry (setting the *Republic* after the *Euthydemus*), the *Euthydemus* reaches an *aporia* when Socrates fails to identify the products of the master art that will lead from the labyrinth. If the master art has no products, its purpose and application to political society remain unclear. For Parry, this *aporia* is then solved in the *Republic*, through the working out of the idea of self-mastery and the city-soul analogy developed in *Republic* IV.¹¹¹ Alex Long takes another approach, suggesting that rather than identifying the kingly art with the philosophical *epistēmē* of the central books, we should consider a 'science of guarding' (*phulakikē epistēmē*) practised by Kallipolis' guards (*Rep.* 4.428d6) as its representative in the *Republic*.¹¹² However, this still leaves a gap in the *Republic*, between the general form of knowledge, *epistēmē* (4.438e1–7), and its specific political form, just as there is a gap between the *sophia* of the first protreptic, and *basilikē technē* in the *Euthydemus*. Others suggest that the philosophers' knowledge of the Form of the Good solves the problem of the product of the kingly art, through the conversion of students through protreptic.¹¹³

Much of this discussion observes that Plato's use of his craft analogy in the *Euthydemus* is flawed.¹¹⁴ Such readings treat the problem of identifying *basilikē technē* as internal to Plato's work, as a problem with Socrates' use of the craft analogy, and not as part of a broader discourse of kingship that already makes use of the craft analogy.¹¹⁵ When Plato wrestles with the difficulties of explaining the output of a superordinate craft within that analogy, he also takes a position within the broader contemporary discourse of kingship, in which *basilikē technē* has qualities that enable it to operate in a distinctive manner because of its pre-eminent position.

The hunt for basilikē technē

These difficulties emerge through considering what kind of education might turn young men such as Cleinias into good and active citizens. The sophist brothers Dionysodorus and Euthydemus represent the exponents of one kind of education, an eristic mode that teaches students to use fallacy to block positive argumentation.¹¹⁶ While the limitations of this approach are explored in the sections in which the brothers illustrate their method on the unsuspecting young Athenians, Socrates takes charge in between to deliver a protreptic in which he encourages Cleinias to take up his form of philosophy, presented as a positive alternative.¹¹⁷ The protreptic sections are carefully linked to provide a continuing argument for engaging in Socratic practice, while their rhetoric suggests that this practice is being set against other philosophical approaches. The first protreptic section (279e3–282d3) establishes the necessity of knowledge to make both the possession and use of other qualities beneficial, through the generation of *eudaimonia*.

In the second protreptic section (288d5–291c2), Socrates argues that there is a *politikē technē*, and identifies it with the craft of kingship. However, the presentation of this identification is problematic, and signalled as such both by the imagery and by the structure of the dialogue. Firstly, there is the use of hunting imagery, which Plato uses to mark the search for knowledge, to compare the qualities of different forms of knowledge, and to register important steps in dialogues. Here Socrates and Cleinias are trying to distinguish different forms of *technē* and to separate out the master form of craft from others. Taking the idea that philosophy is the ‘acquisition of knowledge’ (κτησις ἐπιστήμης, 288d8) from the first protreptic, Socrates leads Cleinias to distinguish between the knowledge of production and the knowledge of use, as in the distinction between knowing how to make a lyre and how to play one (289b7–c4). Writing and delivering speeches shows the same distinction between production and use, so speech-writing can’t be the master art (289c6–8).

Socrates suggests that he has discovered the required art, generalship (290a9–b2). But Cleinias, showing some intellectual initiative, finds a production/use distinction; just as hunters hand over their catch to cooks, and mathematicians to dialecticians, generals hand over what they take (cities) to politicians to administer (290b7–d8). In finding a way to distinguish generals from politicians, Cleinias can answer Xenophon’s Socrates’ linking of leadership skills in a series.

Secondly, there is the emphatic interruption of the reported dialogue by the frame dialogue discussion with Crito (290e1–291a5). Socrates’ reports of Cleinias’ contribution to the conversation have become implausible; has the youthful Cleinias, whose need for education provoked the dialogue’s search for educators, secretly been studying Plato’s later works? Crito is suspicious, interrupting Socrates’ narration to ask who actually made these remarks, and implying that it is unlikely that the lad (*meirakion*) did so himself (290e1–2); if he had done so, he would hardly be in need of any more education.¹¹⁸

Socrates, after dismissing the possibility that the point was made by the sophists, asks whether it wasn’t ‘one of the better beings who was present and said these

things' (μή τις τῶν κρείττονων παρὼν αὐτὰ ἐφθέγγετο, 291a3–4), insisting that he heard the words spoken, although he cannot remember by whom (290e8, 291a5).¹¹⁹ Crito agrees that the remark was made by 'one of the better ones' (291a6–7), but Plato intends some irony; Socrates hints that he received divine inspiration, Crito suggests that Socrates spoke himself.¹²⁰ Just as in the *Gorgias*, Socrates' position is aligned with the divine.¹²¹ But this contrasts with the very human nature of the hunt for the controlling art that ensues when Cleinias rejects the suggested candidate arts. The inadequacy of the investigation is underlined through another hunting image, of children chasing crested larks (291b1–2), an enterprise unlikely to result in successful capture.¹²²

Socrates describes the search for *basilikē technē* undertaken by him and Cleinias as 'like falling into a labyrinth' (ὥσπερ εἰς λαβύρινθον ἐμπεσόντες, 291b7) in which progress 'towards a conclusion' (ἐπὶ τέλει, b8) to the argument is illusory and they continually appear to be back at the beginning (291b1–c1).¹²³

But, from a perspective outside the dialogue, the problem of the labyrinth may be over-stated in the first place; the metaphor need not signal a formal regress, but part of the imagery of kingship, the identification of which is the target of the discussion. Royal labyrinths, such as the Egyptian one described by Herodotus (2.148) were not mazes in which one got lost, but demonstrations of royal power intended to generate *thauma* through their complexity and magnificence (2.148.6).¹²⁴ That labyrinth was constructed to celebrate political unity in Egypt, and was of unparalleled magnificence. And even if Socrates' labyrinth is a maze not simply a winding and ritualised approach to a court, Socrates may be representing Theseus, as he does in the *Phaedo*, the hero who defeated another labyrinth, that of Minos' Crete. Plato uses this imagery to signify the importance of this search for the identity of the master art, a significance introduced by its identification as *basilikē technē*, and that the problem is soluble.

Heroic and mythical imagery permeates this dialogue; but Heracles is a negative presence. Socrates states that he does not have the capabilities of Heracles (297b10–c1), and is unable to fight the hydra of the sophists (297b10–d2), even when Ctesippus steps in as his Iolaus.¹²⁵ The absent presence of Heracles may provide a marker of engagement with Antisthenes, as a proto-Cynic.

Socrates ends the hunt for *basilikē technē* (291c4–292d7) with a surprising claim, telling Crito that he 'thinks that *politikē technē* and *basilikē technē* are the same thing' (ἔδοξε γὰρ δὴ ἡμῖν ἡ πολιτικὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλικὴ τέχνη ἢ αὐτὴ εἶναι, 291c4–5), an 'insouciant equation' that is asserted rather than argued for.¹²⁶ Rather, it is supported through further imagery, the ship-of-state image of the ruling art 'alone at the city's stern' (μόνη ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ καθῆσθαι τῆς πόλεως, 291d1–2), leans on the tragic model of the good king by alluding to Aeschylus.¹²⁷ The image of this special form of skill directing the city alone from the stern also suggests that it is something about the unity and singularity of the top-level leader that ensures their capability.

The consequences of the identification of *politikē technē* with *basilikē technē* are significant. Where Xenophon's Socrates regarded *basilikē technē* as the general skill from which all forms of leadership derive, Plato separates out the skill of the

politikos and *basilikē technē* from military leadership and other lower forms of leadership. By identifying the two forms of *technē*, he is also insisting on the polis context, which was of lesser importance for Antisthenes and less clearly defined by Xenophon. But it is still a surprising connection to make in the context of seeking the good life within the polis, where monarchic rule was usually equated with tyranny and defeat.

Only this *technē* knows how to use the products of other crafts, and so Socrates is confident that he has identified the correct craft, and that it is solely responsible for the city prospering (291c7–d3). The difficulty arises with identifying what in turn is the product of *basilikē technē*. Unlike the counter-examples of medicine and farming, its product is not easily identified. Socrates is sure that some kind of *epistēmē* must be involved, but this generates serious difficulty in that it is a kind of knowledge that produces only itself (292d1–4), the problem that has led to the identification of a regress here.

In the final parts of the dialogue two alternative philosophies of education are offered as potential ways to identify the products of *basilikē technē*. Firstly, Socrates turns to Dionysodorus and Euthydemus to take up the search, in the final eristic section (292e8–293a6). Secondly, Crito recounts his meeting with a man who seemed very wise, presumed from his description to be Isocrates (304d4–305b3); Socrates observes that Prodicus places Isocrates' methodology somewhere between politics and philosophy (305c7). Again, as in Xenophon's accounts in the *Memorabilia*, the identification of the kingly art becomes the site for contests between different philosophical and educational approaches.

But why does Plato identify the controlling political craft with kingship? While the image of kingship clearly suggests a single controlling power set over all other crafts, it introduces its own difficulties; Plato will address these later in the *Statesman*. Kingship may be a good model for superior instances of individual ethical skill or political organisation outside the framework of the polis, and have been exploited as such by Antisthenes and Xenophon, but Plato is committed to investigating the political life of the polis. Just as his Socrates declines to leave Athens, Plato's political thought is precisely directed to the operation of the polis. His problem is that existing accounts of kingship are based either in the mythological imaginary, or in a non-polis context.

The claim that there would be justice in the polis only when philosophers became kings and vice versa (*Rep.* 5.473c11–e1), explored at length in the *Republic's* central epistemological digression, focuses on the identification and development of the ruler *qua* philosopher rather than *qua* king. The description of the character and behaviour of the philosopher-as-ruler, that follows the initial claim, redescribes the philosopher in the language of kingship, linking or identifying the *megaloprepeia* characteristic of the magnificent ruler with the *theoria* of the philosopher (*Rep.* 6.486a8–10).¹²⁸ Rather than judging the individual acts and deeds of subjects, here characterised as the world of becoming, in order to dispense justice, the philosopher king will be enabled to do so through his contemplation of being (6.500bd).¹²⁹ Plato takes the model of the king as the possessor of special capabilities and refines those capabilities as the capacity for philosophical episteme.

The philosopher-king's knowledge is assimilated to the *politikē technē* claimed by Socrates in the *Gorgias*.

Kingship itself, as a constitution and political practice, receives little further discussion in the *Republic*; the later analysis of constitutions (books VIII–IX) schematises the decline from this ideal setting, and concludes with an analysis of tyranny and the character of the tyrant. Although there is much discussion of the disappearance of the philosopher king from Plato's later political thought, the political and practical aspects monarchical half of the construct is not fully established within the *Republic*.¹³⁰ Instead, Plato relies on the combination of the traditional account of kingship and the paradox of its presence within the polis to introduce the account of knowledge that is his main concern. The philosopher king, it seems, will be a king in the cosmic sense of an agent of unity and stability, rather than through the instantiation of specific political practices associated with historical kingship.

The *Republic*'s account of tyranny furthers Plato's contestation of the conventional sophistic concept of the happy tyrant, first opened in the *Gorgias*, and more clearly engaged with historical instances of tyranny.

Conclusion

Identifying and naming the quality and skill that enables individuals to lead and ultimately to rule causes difficulty for both Xenophon and Plato. Antisthenes, less focused on the inner workings of the polis and its ideology of citizen equality, can use non-polis examples more freely; his fragments provide evidence that Socrates used the figure of Cyrus as an exemplar of individual virtue rather than as an instance of barbarian despotism. The legacy of Antisthenes' political thought is perhaps the use of non-Greek, non-polis exemplars to explore virtue in leadership.

Xenophon also used non-polis examples of political excellence, notably Cyrus, but often assimilates non-polis structures such as the *ethnos* state to those of the polis, for example in exploring analogies between Persia and the Greek household. While Xenophon is aware of social ontological distinctions between these entities, he chooses to collapse them at times, while asserting the distinctiveness of kingship and the kingly at others. For Xenophon, identifying a skill as kingly marks it as superior to the skills of other forms of leadership, the political or the military or the household, in a hierarchy that he finds natural. The combination of the laws of Athens and Persia within the perfect household of Ischomachus represents Xenophon's political ideal, an instance of mixture that will recur in Xenophon's further inquiries into kingship.

Plato's use of the craft analogy to explore political order also causes him some difficulties, as he builds a model in which all crafts must have a product as output. Again, the problem of identifying the distinctive features of either the ruling craft or the individual capable of wielding it remains unsolved. Where he assimilates political and kingly skill, as in the *Euthydemus*, he is unable to identify the nature of that skill, part because of the difficulties incurred by the craft analogy and its requirement for tangible outputs. Socrates' justification of his personal *politikē*

technē in the *Gorgias*, where it is assimilated in his myth to the judgement of semi-divine figures in the underworld, remains in play through the *Euthydemus*' allusions to myth and divinity. In this sense, Plato is able to distinguish the specific skill of Socrates through mythical narrative and allusion.

A more political investigation of the kingly art is found in the *Statesman* rather than the *Republic*, despite that dialogue's invocation of the philosopher king. But before Plato can set out his own political theory, he needs to distance his own conceptualisation of kingship from that of his contemporaries. His later dialogues' extensive use of mythical and historical narrative enables him to do this.

Notes

- 1 Strathern 2019: 4–6.
- 2 Döring 2011; Ford 2010 survey the development of the Socratic dialogue in terms of genre.
- 3 The origins of *patrios politeia* arguments provide a parallel case; the term was both used and disputed in the 410s, and is represented in the *Ath. Pol.* as crucial to debate on the 411–410 oligarchies (*Ath. Pol.* 29–33). Rhodes 1993: 362–9; cf. Atack 2010.
- 4 Horky forthcoming
- 5 See Mossé 1978 on the *patrios politeia* and foundation myth.
- 6 *RO* 11=*IG* II² 20, honours to Evagoras, exemplifies democratic response to a marginal figure identified as a *basileus* (line 6); Evagoras was granted further honours post-411 (*IG* I³ 113), and Athenian citizenship (at an unknown date, *Isoc. Evag.* 54); Rhodes and Osborne 2003: 52–5.
- 7 Kahn 1994: 90–1.
- 8 Döring 2011; Thomas 2003: 177–8.
- 9 Antisthenes *SSR* V A 53–4. See Prince 2015: 188–232.
- 10 Antisthenes on rhapsodes and Homeric interpretation (Fr. 185, cf. Frs. 187–91); *Gorgias Palamedes*; Plato *Ion* 540d1–541c6, *Xen. Smp.* 3.5–6 on the foolishness of rhapsodes. *Odysseus in Antisthenes*: Fr. 54.
- 11 Dorion 2008; Giannantoni 1990: IV.321–2; Luz 1996; Rankin 1986: 101–5. Mythical narratives by Plato and Isocrates also use the same characters; Prometheus: Plato *Protagoras*; Heracles: Isocrates *Helen*, *Busiris*, *Philip*.
- 12 Main sources for Antisthenes: DL 6.1–19; as a character in Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.5, *Smp.* 3.7–8, 4.1–6, 34–44, 56–64. Plato depicts him as present at Socrates' death, and thus a close associate (Pl. *Phd.* 59b). Some sources, such as DL 6.104–5 (= Frs. 98–99), may incorporate later Cynic material; Susan Prince, notes the tensions between testimonia that position Antisthenes as Socratic and Cynic (2015: 12–14).
- 13 Guthrie 1971: 304; DL 6.1–2.
- 14 Brancacci 1992 reconstructs Antisthenes' *Peri basileias* from Dio Chrysostom *Oration* 3; Moles 1984; Sidebottom 2006 survey the context and ancestry of Dio Chrysostom's kingship orations. Dümmler (1889: 1–17) conjectures that Antisthenes' *Archelaus* is represented in Dio Chrys. *Oration* 13.14–28.
- 15 Navia 2001 examines Antisthenes' Socratic connections; Rankin 1986 perhaps overplays them. Giannantoni (1990: 403–11) surveys the limited textual evidence for Antisthenes' political thought; see also Brancacci 2013 for an overview.
- 16 Compare Dümmler 1889; Höistad 1948: 5–8; Joël 1893 with Guthrie 1971: 26–8, which attempts to deconstruct the 'Antisthenes cult', cf. Chroust 1957. Susan Prince notes the afterlife of Joël's 'ambitious and often reckless' portrayal of Antisthenes, but does not trace its history post-Popper; Popper 1966: 161, 307–10 positions Antisthenes as an 'equalitarian' alternative to Plato's illiberal Socrates; an analysis taken

- up by Jacques Rancière in his critique of Plato (Rancière 2007: 59–62 on ‘La pensée bâtarde’).
- 17 Cyrus: Frs. 85–7, 141, 198–201; Heracles: Frs. 92–9. *Ponos* is a means of producing communal benefit (cf. Xen. *Mem.* 2.1, Johnstone 1994).
- 18 DL 2.61 claims that Aeschines ‘plagiarised’ works by Antisthenes on Heracles, Cyrus and Alcibiades.
- 19 The biographical tradition that Antisthenes lacked citizen status possibly derives from this: DL 6.1, Frs. 1, 3. Rankin 1986: 123–7.
- 20 Caizzi argues that Plato was responding to Antisthenes, who drew a contrast between king and tyrant here: Caizzi 1966: 101; Prince 2015: 686. Dio Chrys. *Or.* 13.14–24 may also draw on this *Archelaus*; Giannantoni 1990: IV.351.
- 21 Athenaeus 220c = Fr. 141. Giannantoni 1990: IV.296–7 notes that some of the four works on Cyrus catalogued by DL (Fr. 41.70–1) may be better titled *Kurios* (cf. Caizzi 1966: 86), and also that the titles may be doublets or fictitious. Høistad 1948: 92–4 and Caizzi 1966: 93 concur that the elder Cyrus is the most likely subject.
- 22 This reading is supported by Susan Prince’s translation and commentary of this fragment (Prince 2015: 310–11). The maxim was widely quoted in antiquity, by Plutarch (*Life of Alexander* 41.2), Marcus Aurelius (*To Himself* VII 36) and Dio Chrysostom (*Public Address* 47).
- 23 Other testimony for this fragment (DL 6.7, Stobaeus II 31, 34) does not name Cyrus.
- 24 Cf. Pl. *Meno* 70a1–2, Xen. *Smp.* 2.6, Xen. *Mem.* 4.8.11, where Socrates is ‘capable of encouraging (προτρέψασθαι) towards virtue and gentlemanliness (ἀρετὴν καὶ καλοκαγαθίαν); Guthrie 1971: 250–60; Prince 2015: 338–9.
- 25 Schofield 1999b: 121–3 suggests that ‘Antisthenes espouses a high-minded antinomianism’.
- 26 The Socrates–Alcibiades dialogue was a favourite form of Socratic dialogue, exemplified by Aeschines’ *Alcibiades* (Kahn 1994). Against Caizzi see Caizzi 1966: 97–8; Giannantoni 1990: IV.347–8; Prince 2015: 414–15.
- 27 Cf. Herodotus’ positioning of the Athenian Alcmaeonids as morally problematic proto-tyrants (6.121–31).
- 28 Although Polyphemus’ disdain for Zeus shows him to be unjust.
- 29 Cf. Patzer 1970: 72–3.
- 30 Høistad 1948: 33. On the unreliability of Diogenes Laertius’ catalogue, see Giannantoni 1990: IV.309–13; Patzer 1970.
- 31 Such as Isocrates’ comparison of Theseus and Heracles as political benefactors (*Helen* 23–4).
- 32 Galinsky 1972: 57–9. Isocrates’ political mythology exploited the dependence of Heracles and the Heraclids on Athens.
- 33 See below on Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.
- 34 Preserved via a Syriac translation of the fourth-century CE orator and philosopher Themistius (Luz 1996).
- 35 Tamiolaki 2012.
- 36 Moles 1995.
- 37 Both Xenophon and Plato’s depictions of Socrates are literary and fictive and should be acknowledged as such: Dorion 2011. Joël’s view that Xenophon’s Socrates was a vehicle for Antisthenes’ thoughts (Joël 1893) is hardly more extreme than Vlastos’ idealisation of Plato’s Socrates as an exemplary democrat (Vlastos 1994, cf. Morrison 1987). The centrality of leadership to Xenophon’s thought: Luccioni 1948: 53–9; Sandridge 2012; Wood 1964.
- 38 Dorion 2010: 288 n.21.
- 39 For opposing views on Plato’s use of the craft analogy, see Irwin 1977: 71–7 and the extended exploration in Roochnik 1998.
- 40 Quite where the *Euthydemus* should be fitted within a developmental account of Plato’s own discussion of these topics also remains a topic of debate.

- 41 Unitarian and developmental schools of thought dispute the dating of Xenophon's writings (Dillery 1995). Dorion argues that speculation about who originated the term *basilikē technē* is uninteresting (2004: 60); the idea that it is an established *topos* or image is more interesting, as is the choice of the word *basilikē* itself (cf. Johnson 2005).
- 42 Vlastos 1983, 1994: 101–4.
- 43 Chernyakhovskaya 2014: 213–14; Dorion 2004: 53–8; Morrison 1987, especially n.52.
- 44 Dorion 2011: 139–45. See the discussion of *Mem.* 4.2 for more on the related virtues of *enkrateia* over the body/bodily desire and *sōphrosunē* over the soul/rational thought.
- 45 The nature of the distinction between expert general and expert king is not fully identified here beyond the label *basilikē*; Xenophon addresses this in analysing Cyrus' transformation into a king (*Cyropaedia* 7.5.37–8.2.28) (see Chapter 5).
- 46 Xenophon often gathers short-term practical needs and the ability to fulfil them under the term *ōphelos* and *ōpheleia*. This is often interpreted as narrow consequentialism and at odds with ethical concern (hence Vlastos' and others' reluctance to treat him as an ethical thinker). But Xenophon often, as here, regards the ability to meet short-term material or practical needs and to satisfy a longer-term goal of flourishing as parallel capabilities that should be delivered by the same leader.
- 47 Gray 1998: 142–4, cf. Nancy 1995. As Gray notes, the appearance of favourite instances of the craft analogies in the definition of kingship precedes a series of conversations between Socrates and lower status craft workers (*Mem.* 3.10–11).
- 48 Johnson (2009: 204–5) identifies the structural role of Socrates' encounters with Aristippus in the *Memorabilia*.
- 49 Gray 2011b: 18–19; McNamara 2009 both overlook the use of specifically Athenian kingship imagery in these dialogues.
- 50 In the *Anabasis* and the *Cyropaedia* the adjective is used entirely non-metaphorically, to describe objects belonging to Cyrus the younger and elder respectively; tents (*Cyr.* 8.5.3), armies (*Ana.* 2.2.12, 2.2.16, 3.5.16, *Cyr.* 8.8.6). In the *Agesilaus* and *Hellenica* it describes the king's tomb (*Ages.* 11.16, *Hell.* 5.3.19).
- 51 Morrison 2004.
- 52 See n.25 above.
- 53 Strauss 1972: 32–6; Newell 1983 argues that in the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon creates a category intermediate between kingship and tyranny, that of extra-legal rule over willing subjects. Gray 2011a: 56–7; Johnson 2009.
- 54 Gray 1998: 124–9 shows how this dialogue represents a final amplification of the exploration of *enkrateia* first introduced at 1.5.1.
- 55 Dorion and Bandini 2000: ccxxi–iv; Erbse 1961, 1980; Gray 1998: 56.
- 56 Dorion and Bandini 2011: III.75. Xenophon goes on to say that this virtue makes its possessor good at managing both cities and households.
- 57 Dorion and Bandini 2011: 2.143, 3.75 n.5). This argument first appears in Dorion 2004: 53 n.13: 'L'art royal est ainsi l'art de gouverner les hommes'.
- 58 It also sits badly with *Mem.* 4.2.11, where the *technē* is stated to be 'the noblest kind of excellence (*kallistēs aretēs*), the greatest (*megistēs*) of arts'.
- 59 Morrison 2004.
- 60 For example in the description of Persian institutions in *Cyr.* 1.2, Hirsch 1985: 85–91.
- 61 Although there is a sense in which Xenophon assimilates all human groupings to the model of a polis, as he does in the *Anabasis* where the 10,000 on the march are presented as a (potential) polis. Such assimilation of kingdoms, cities and households is vulnerable to objections raised by Aristotle in *Politics* I.
- 62 Ricoeur 1976, 2003: see Introduction.
- 63 Ney 2008: 187–8.
- 64 Xenophon uses Aristippus to identify a strand of Socratic thought; the Cyrenaic philosophy identified with Aristippus is a later phenomenon (as with Antisthenes and Cynicism, cf. Tsouna-McKirahan 1994).

- 65 Johnson 2009: 209–10. This reading of 2.1.10–16 originates with Strauss (Strauss 1972: 32–6).
- 66 Higgins 1977: 24–6.
- 67 Nancy 1995: 82 points to Grote's connection between Aristippus' rejection of the choice between ruling and being ruled (ἄρχειν/ἄρχεσθαι, 2.1.12) and Socrates' reluctant choice between committing and suffering injustice (ἄδικεῖν/ἄδικεῖσθαι, *Grg.* 469c1–2), which he qualifies on the basis that they have not yet agreed a definition of 'ruling as a tyrant', τὸ τυραννεῖν (Grote 1865: III.537).
- 68 Erbse 1980: 8; Nancy 1995: 78.
- 69 Luccioni 1948: 56. The *Anabasis* and *Cyropaedia* contain further examples of these themes, for example, Cyrus' exhortation to the Persians, *Cyr.* 1.5.9–13.
- 70 Johnson 2009 rejects this (Straussian) reading through analysis of the argument's dialogic context; considering Xenophon's emphasis on kingship as a discrete quality (as in Morrison 2004) provides a further counter-argument.
- 71 Even if Aristippus rejects the laws and institutions of the city, and the obligations they impose, as a traveller he would still depend on unwritten laws that imposed the religious obligations of hospitality to strangers under the protection of Zeus.
- 72 Johnson 2009: 210–11. The dialogue between the *Memorabilia* and the *Gorgias* is also explored within the Straussian tradition; see Dorion 2010: 298–9.
- 73 Scholars dispute whether Xenophon shaped this narrative, or reported an authentic retelling by Prodicus (Dorion 2008; Gray 2006; Johnstone 1994; Nancy 1995). Nicolaïdou-Kyrianidou (1998) reads it as an argument against tyranny.
- 74 Dorion highlights the connection made by many between 4.2.31–5 and the discussion of the necessity of virtue for the use of good qualities in *Euthydemus* 278e–281e. Others have seen links to the *Hippias Minor* (Johnson 2005: 61), and the *Alcibiades* (109b–116e) (Dorion and Bandini 2011: 3.106, 3.76 n.6).
- 75 Chernyakhovskaya 2014: 210–16; Dorion 2010: 288 n.21; Erbse 1961: 274–5; Morrison 1994.
- 76 At *Mem.* 4.1.1, Socrates is described as 'useful in every way' (πάντα τρόπον ὠφέλιμος). See n.45.
- 77 It may respond to Plato's use of the term at *Rep.* 5.473d3, and connect Xenophon's account to the *Republic*.
- 78 Gabriel Danzig notes the irony of Socrates, presented as a failure in terms of wealth and domestic unity (e.g. *Smp.* 2.10), discussing the management of household and property (Danzig 2003a, esp. 60–2).
- 79 Luccioni 1948: 91.
- 80 Sarah Pomeroy notes how the parallels are drawn between Persian kingdom and Greek household, with the *paradeisos* and country estate as intermediates (Pomeroy 1994: 238–42). She also notes the importance of agriculture and gardening as activities for kings in a range of Near Eastern sources. See also Kuhrt 2007a: section 20.
- 81 Another example of the problematisation of the teachability of virtue in Socratic thought.
- 82 This remark gains force if the *kai* is treated as epexegetic.
- 83 The idea of leadership or kingship as a form of mixed constitution emerges more clearly in the *Cyropaedia*; see next chapter.
- 84 Pomeroy (1994: 343) suggests farming and ruling differ in their need for *paideia*.
- 85 Sandridge 2012 ascribes a developed theory of leadership to Xenophon, although he does not investigate kingship or discuss these passages; cf. Gray 2011a; Wood 1964.
- 86 Dorion 2004: 54.
- 87 Ober (1998: 156–62) summarises twentieth-century responses to Plato and his thought on democracy, including the trend to read Plato's use of dialogue as support for democratic practice (cf. Euben 2003; Monoson 2000; Saxonhouse 2006); Schofield (2006: 55–9) considers Plato in the context of deliberative democracy.

- 88 Beyond the unstated assumption that practice of the kingly art requires knowledge of the Form of the Good, as argued by Parry (2003: 22–6).
- 89 Euben 1996; Monoson 2000; Ober 1998. Euben attempts to position Socrates in the *Gorgias* as a reformer of a now-corrupt democracy, rather than an opponent of its practices and the corruption they entail, but fails to account for the possibility of discursive and bouleutic practice as a feature of general polis governance rather than of democracy specifically (cf. Barber 1996).
- 90 Nightingale 1995: 80–1 argues that the *Gorgias* is primarily in dialogue with tragedy, but this seems unduly limiting. The *Gorgias* uses many figures of Athenian rhetoric, such as the city as tyrant (Kallet 2003).
- 91 Dodds 1959: 241–2 ad 470c9.
- 92 The contested value of examples from the past, or between different layers of the past, is often highlighted, as in the rhetoric of the Athenian funeral speech, and its mythical exemplars of great deeds, cf. Th. 2.36.4.
- 93 Euripides also wrote an *Archelaus*, for performance at the Macedonian court; its surviving fragments suggest a thematic focus on tyranny, virtue and justice (Collard and Cropp 2008: 1.229–33, Frs. 232, 250, 252).
- 94 This may reply to Xenophon and Antisthenes.
- 95 The function and the validity of the craft analogy as a model for virtue have been debated extensively (Irwin 1977; Roochnik 1998), but its use as a political concept is somewhat distinct from this, despite Plato's slippages between *aretē* (322d7, 323a1) and *technē* (322b3, b5), perhaps attributable to his character Protagoras.
- 96 Following Schofield (2010b: 29 n.28) in the interpretation of δικαιοσύνην at 464b8.
- 97 Denyer 2013: 162–5. Socrates suggests earlier that Protagoras' *euboulia* equates to *politikē technē* (318e5–319a5), cf. Long 2013: 16.
- 98 Cf. Xen. *Oec.* 1.22–3, where appetitive desires are 'mistresses' (δέσποιναι) that attack the bodies and estates of men, and Pl. *Rep.* 8.563c6, where dogs in the democratic city become like their mistresses.
- 99 One of many references to Socrates' trial within the *Gorgias*.
- 100 Dodds 1959: 23.
- 101 Cf. *Rep.* 6.501b1–502a2, an idealised version of this process that results in Kallipolis.
- 102 Stalley 2007: 120.
- 103 Sedley 2009.
- 104 All three traditionally associated with good judgement, Minos as a judge in the underworld (*Od.* 11.568); Dodds 1959: 374–5.
- 105 Cf. Annas (1982: 122–5), who points to the scholarly focus on religious and ethical interpretations of the myth.
- 106 Ausland (2000: 24) notes that this links Plato to the ideas of his contemporaries.
- 107 Given that a parody cannot precede its original. Kahn (2000: 89–90) regards the relationship between the *Euthydemus* as proleptic outline to full treatment rather than original to parody; Lane (1997: 3 n.8) cites Myles Burnyeat's view that the dialogue post-dates the *Republic* and provides a critical commentary on it, cf. Burnyeat 2002.
- 108 Nancy 1984: 179–84. However, David Roochnik (1998: 152–6) argues that the dialogue is early.
- 109 Cf. Antisthenes VA 152 = Arist. *Met.* Δ.1024b26–34. Hawtrey (1981: 24–5), drawing on Isocrates *Helen* 1), suggests that the final eristic section's sophistic fallacies are Megaric (cf. Dorion 2000).
- 110 See James Collins' narratological reading (Collins 2015: 53–154), and Burnyeat 2002: 62–3.
- 111 Kahn 2000: 92–3.
- 112 Long 2013: 27–9.
- 113 Roochnik 1990; Sprague 1962: 21–2, 1976: 48–56.
- 114 Irwin 1977: 76; Sprague 1976: 53, both cited by Roochnik 1998: 175–6.

- 115 Although Roochnik worries that his conclusion, which emphasises the role of protreptic in Socratic teaching, minimises the difference between the offerings of Plato and Isocrates (Roochnik 1998: 176–7).
- 116 The epilogue (304c6–307c) will also suggest that the rhetorical education of a teacher who bridges philosophy and politics is also inadequate; this is usually interpreted as a reference (304d5) to Isocrates (Canto-Sperber 1989: 34–6; Hawtrey 1981: 190–1); Nails (2002: 178–80) does not include this reference, but notes Isocrates’ appearance in the *Phaedrus* (cf. Collins 2015: 69); Sermamoglou-Soulmaidi 2014: 143–51 suggests a reference to *Against the Sophists* and its diatribe against eristics.
- 117 Also aimed at the external audience. Much scholarship on the *Euthydemus* focuses on the arguments of the eristic sections (e.g. Keulen 1971), but, as Roochnik and Collins note, much of the real work happens in the protreptic sections (Collins 2015; Roochnik 1998: 156).
- 118 Chance 1992: 122–4; Hawtrey 1981: 129–30, the latter noting that the repeated ‘voiced’ (ἐφθέγγατο) stresses the sound’s physicality.
- 119 Roochnik 1998: 168 regards this as a ‘mystery . . . unparalleled in the dialogues’, but notes other occasions when Plato’s characters attribute knowledge to the divine (*Laches* 196a5–7).
- 120 Chance 1992: 122–4.
- 121 Cf. *Gorgias* 488b–492e. Plato insinuated that Socrates already knew the outcome of the discussion with Cleinias at 289d10–c1, where Socrates notes (to Crito, prefiguring the interruption of the narration?) that he already thought that they would find the knowledge somewhere ‘around there’ (ἐνταῦθα πού) where they had ‘long since’ (πάλαι) been looking.
- 122 Cf. the *Republic*’s heroic boar-hunt simile with which Socrates identifies the hunt for justice (*Rep.* 4.432b8–d4). In both dialogues the hunting image provides a form of epic delay, as with the boar-hunt narrative which precedes Odysseus’ recognition by his hunting scar (*Od.* 19.386–475).
- 123 Sprague (1976: 50–2) argues that this passage introduces a complex regress, one intended by Plato to show the failure of Socrates’ argument.
- 124 Herodotus notes the ritual and religious functions of the labyrinth, although he is not permitted to enter its sacred lower level. He is ambiguous about the labyrinth’s complexity: its passages include εἰλγμοὶ . . . ποικιλότατοι, but Herodotus’ emphasis is on size and magnificence rather than confusion.
- 125 Jackson 1990: 378.
- 126 Rappe 2000; Schofield 2006: 153; Schofield points to an existing discourse on kingship familiar to Plato’s audience, but underplays the impact that this strong identification (and repetition of *basilikē* throughout the discussion, 291d7, 292c4) would have for the internal audience of the dialogue, another example of the contrast between dramatic setting and contemporary discourse that Plato marks throughout the *Euthydemus*.
- 127 The image appears in addresses to kings at *Septem* 2 and *Supp.* 345, also at *Sept.* 760.
- 128 Taking the *kai* connecting these nouns as epexegetic would be helpful here.
- 129 Schofield 2006: 161–3. Schofield goes on to note the difficulties that commentators have had reconciling the argument of this section with the ‘Noble Lie’ (Schofield 2006: 301–3, cf. Schofield 2009).
- 130 Schofield 1999a: 31–50.

5 Virtue and monarchy

When Xenophon depicts his character Cyrus saying that ‘the duties of a good king are like those of a shepherd’ (Cyr. 8.2.14), he invokes a powerful image with a long heritage in Near Eastern cultures, and familiar to his readers as Homer’s epithet for Agamemnon.¹ Both Xenophon and Isocrates develop their thought on kingship most fully outside the Athenian context, building on their Athens-based explorations of Socratic thought (Xenophon) and Athenian mythical kingship (Isocrates) through the deployment of further exemplars of leadership and kingship in cities and *ethnos* states elsewhere, such as Cyrus’ Persia. The non-Athenian rulers they describe provide models of political virtue, and deliver the good life for their citizens and subjects through their own practice of virtue. These models contribute to systems of virtue ethics in which kingship underpins the communal achievement of *eudaimonia*, a process explored through exemplary narratives. They rest on the virtuous rulers’ ability to distribute reward within society according to accurate assessment of individual worth, through the mechanism of geometric equality.² While Isocrates and Xenophon are rarely invoked in surveys of ancient ethical thought, both are concerned with *eudaimonia* as well as the shorter-term beneficial consequences of choice and action, and their views place them closer to Aristotle’s model of practical wisdom than to any purely consequentialist alternative.³ Their choice of exemplars also continues the Herodotean comparative aspect of the discourse of kingship, and illustrate the transition from ‘cosmic’ to ‘heroic’ models of kingship identified by Strathern.⁴

In their case studies, there are two levels of imitation within the text, informing the potential external audience outside the text: firstly, the king himself imitates, or is advised to imitate, exemplars from the past, either his own semi-divine ancestors at the start of his genealogy, or more recent examples provided by the author. Secondly, privileged citizens or courtiers achieve virtue and fulfilment through imitation of the *paradeigma* of character virtues provided by the king. This imitation may be more or less complete and successful, although the imitators will never match the virtue of the original; theorists explore the reasons that the king is an original and the subject of imitation, offering a variety of grounds for establishing the difference between ruling original and the ruled copy, such as the specific quality of the ‘great soul’ of the ruler, the *megalopsychia* of great men, that may amount to an political–ontological distinction between ruler and ruled.

However, a weakness for the model is that, at the larger scale of empire, direct imitation of the king is impossible for far-flung subjects, who must imitate or obey a construct they have imagined, with no direct contact with his charismatic presence, although his charisma may be sufficient to generate a presence in the imaginary.⁵ There is also a tension between virtue and utility as motivations for monarchs in encouraging their citizens towards the fulfilment of the good life. Isocrates, in particular, is reluctant to explore and theorise the nature of virtue, and prefers to assume agreed values for key concepts (such as ‘the excellence . . . agreed by all’, τὴν ἀρετὴν . . . τὴν ὑπὸ πάντων ὁμολογουμένην, *Antidosis* 84), closing down the disputation on the nature of virtue for which he criticises rival thinkers.⁶

Both Xenophon and Isocrates, in their fullest accounts of monarchy, have been regarded as originators of the Hellenistic, post-classical genre of works on kingship, often taking the form of advice offered to kings, which in the Middle Ages would gain the name of ‘Mirror for Princes’ or *Fürstenspiegel*.⁷ While it is tempting, as Pierre Hadot does, to trace a line from Egyptian, Near Eastern royal texts, and Homeric epic through fourth-century political thought and on to the Middle Ages, the argument of the fourth-century BCE texts responds to a distinctive political context, as Walter Eder has suggested.⁸ Eder also attempts to reposition the texts as advice aimed at the aristocratic factions within the Greek polis, although he acknowledges the role of Athenian educators in teaching young nobles from the more monarchical fringes of the Greek world.⁹

This chapter re-examines the works in which Isocrates and Xenophon develop theorised models of good kingship through narrating the lives of historical, albeit idealised, individuals, with a focus on Isocrates’ Cyprian orations, the *Nicocles* and *Evagoras*, and on Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*.¹⁰ It shows how they look back to previous thought on kingship and tyranny in developing a distinctive model that replaces previous accounts of the difference between the two forms of monarchical rule, while remaining in dialogue with both contemporary thought and the monarchical thought of epic and tradition.¹¹ In drawing on non-Greek exemplars, they follow Antisthenes and other Socratics, and in emphasising the importance of knowledge and virtue they demonstrate a greater connection with Plato than Eder allows them, although the tension between the utility of practical skills and the more abstract rewards of virtue is a continuing presence within these texts and suggests that the authors are aware of their need to position themselves in relation to theory and practice. In both Isocrates and Xenophon, transmission of virtue within the narrative is matched by a transmission of knowledge and excellence from writer/teacher to reader/student, as the reader interprets examples of moral excellence that require careful thought to evaluate.

Isocrates’ model of virtue monarchy: the kings of Salamis

In his ‘Cyprian’ works Isocrates sets out a model in which the good king is an exemplar for citizens to imitate, just as, in his *Helen*, he encouraged the Athenians to imitate Theseus.¹² The three ‘speeches’, each representing a different rhetorical

sub-genre, have mostly been treated as display speeches or teaching materials, but the *Nicocles* contains a detailed account of the relationship between kingship and virtue, and the *Evagoras* provides a case study through its encomium of the titular monarch, as well as comparing mythical and recent historical exemplars.¹³ These works probably date from the 370–360s BCE, and represent an early flowering of the equation of good monarchy with the monarch's possession of character virtues developed in the 'Mirror for Princes' genre. Isocrates' account of the practice of virtue monarchy appears to inform Aristotle's account of the second route to the preservation of tyranny, its transformation into a virtue-based constitutional monarchy (Ar. Pol. 5.11.1314a29–1315a24).¹⁴

The themes of leadership and virtue permeate all three works, but are the specific focus of the *Nicocles*, an address by Nicocles, the young ruler of the Greek city of Salamis in Cyprus, to his people, reminiscent of the speeches of Theseus and Demophon in tragedy. Nicocles explains the qualities of monarchy (14–28), and presents the qualities the ruler must display to be a *paradeigma* (36) for the citizens to imitate (29–47).¹⁵ The speech's conclusion (48–62) implies that the citizens of Salamis have not always treated their ruler with quite such respect, suggesting that the application of this model to practical politics may not be straightforward.

While the political arguments in these works have been dismissed as rhetorical exercises or the product of a commission from Nicocles, rather than treated as part of Isocrates' main body of work, the model of monarchy they contain is consistent with Isocrates' previous treatment of Theseus, but represents the qualities of the good ruler in a contemporary, historical rather than a mythical character, a significant shift in temporality.

However, Isocrates can express the paradoxical re-presentation of arguments against tyranny as arguments for monarchy more safely through the marginal and relatively powerless figure of the Cypriot monarchs, rather than powerful kings who were threats to Athens, such as the Great King of Persia. Isocrates thus steps back from the strong claims for this model that Xenophon will make in the *Cyropaedia*; although he later uses myth to link Philip to Athens in the *Panathenaicus*, that positions Philip as an absent power, who has delegated his authority over the city to pursue further conquest elsewhere, rather than as an active and oppressive presence within it.¹⁶ In the Cyprian orations, the historical virtue king is still a long way from Athens.

The merging of Isocrates' voice with that of his protagonist, noted by Yun Lee Too, emphasises the contribution of these works to Isocrates' overall model.¹⁷ However, one can distinguish two processes of mimesis Isocrates activated by Isocrates' texts: Isocrates' students, the external audience, should learn through copying him, while the addressees of speeches – Nicocles himself (*Evagoras*), the citizens of Salamis (*Nicocles*) should learn from copying the exemplars presented in the works. But in some cases this copy will be incomplete, as the virtue available to Nicocles exceeds that available to those with no claim to being 'gentlemen' (*kaloskagathos*) (cf. *Nic.* 43).

While the specific position of the monarch was not available to students within Athenian society (though presumably available to some of Plato's and Isocrates'

students returning to societies outside Athens, as Nicocles himself may have done), the incomplete and asymmetrical nature of mimesis would not transform them into full instantiations of virtue monarchy.¹⁸ In the same way, becoming a *paradeigma* is an option available only to those already in a privileged position, for example through descent from heroes, although Isocrates attempts to create other justifications for the position of the monarch over citizens.

The highly rhetorical introduction to the *Nicocles* concludes with a discussion of the power of *logos* (5–9), which, Nicocles argues, is what provides us with laws, enables us to discern the just and unjust, and so live together (7).¹⁹ True, just and lawful *logos* is the image (*eidolon*) of the good and faithful soul (8), and is also necessary for ‘intelligent actions’ (τῶν φρονίμως πραττομένων, 9). Eucken argues that this ‘hymn to *logos*’ is a response to Plato’s *Gorgias*, continuing the investigation of the relationship between language and politics, while Poulakos links the section to the myth of Plato’s *Protagoras*.²⁰ Ekaterina Haskins points out that leadership is central to Isocrates’ account of human society, with *logos* acting as the leader that enables human community to develop.²¹ At the levels of both speech and action, it is the quality of the leader that will result in improvement and the correct outcome. Isocrates emphasises excellence of character as the basis of knowledge and the ability to use *logos* well; Plato and Xenophon’s concern with political and kingly *technē* develops an additional layer in which the use of *logos* becomes significant, along with the possession of knowledge and character virtues.

Nicocles goes on to identify certain speeches as ‘the finest (καλλίστους) and most regal (βασιλικωτάτους), and most fitting to [him]’, those ‘giving advice about personal habits (ἐπιτηδευμάτων) and political ways of life (πολιτειῶν)’ (10). Such speeches can also be divided into those addressed to rulers and those to the ruled; given that Isocrates himself (presumably a reference to the *Ad Nicoclem*) has already addressed the former (11), he will proceed to address those he rules.²² With this setup, Isocrates introduces both his most full account of kingship, explaining why a ruler should advise his subjects on how to live, as well as then delivering that advice.

The qualities of monarchy

Nicocles’ first goal is to prove to his subjects that they are governed under the best constitution (14–28), and his second that his own position in this order is just (29–47). The first of these sections sets out those specific qualities of monarchy that explain its superiority to other constitutions. These qualities are wide-ranging, covering epistemic and ontological claims about monarchy, but also appealing to the prudential and pragmatic consequences of monarchical regimes, suggesting that there is an element of utility in Isocrates’ justifications for both monarchy and virtuous behaviour by both ruler and ruled, not dissimilar to Xenophon’s interest in the advantageous.

Monarchy is, Nicocles claims, the only constitution to assess the worth of individuals correctly and to guarantee rewards proportionate to merit. Isocrates equates such distribution with justice; it would be ‘most terrible’ (δεινότατον, 14)

to consider ‘good men’ (τοὺς χρηστούς) and ‘bad’ (τοὺς πονηρούς) as the same, but in contrast ‘most just’ (δικαιότατον) ‘to practise discrimination’ (τὸ διωρίσθαι) and ‘not treat men of like worth the same as their dissimilars’ (μὴ τοὺς ἀνομοίους τῶν ὁμοίων τυγχάνειν). And the constitution that most accurately ‘acts towards and honours each according to their worth’ (14) is monarchy, since ‘monarchical regimes distribute most to the best’ (αἱ δὲ μοναρχίαι πλεῖστον μὲν νέμονται τῷ βελτίστῳ, 15), and then less in proportion as individuals’ merit declines. While oligarchies and democracies offer the prospect that non-equals will receive equal shares of any distribution of social and material goods, monarchy enforces a strict hierarchy in accordance with worth.

Isocrates’ claim is that monarchy, because of the discriminatory ability of the monarch, can deliver a correctly hierarchised meritocracy, which is in the interests of elite subjects, as well as those of the monarch. Monarchy best assesses the characters of citizens because it knows them best. Rather than being an unpleasant feature of tyranny, the king’s surveillance of his people’s actions and characters, as exemplified by Herodotus’ Deioces (Hdt 1.100.2) and Xenophon’s Cyrus (*Cyr.* 8.2.10–12, 22) and noted by Aristotle (*Pol.* 3.16.1287b29–30) becomes a positive mechanism that enables the correct distribution of reward. Isocrates suggests that ‘absolutely everyone would agree’ (ἅπαντες ἄν . . . ὁμολογήσαιεν) that monarchies (τυραννίδας, 16) do this more than other regimes do, and that it does not purely benefit the ruler.²³ The knowledge gained by the king through monarchical surveillance benefits all, by assuring just distribution and the correct assessment of individual merit or excellence. Isocrates could elaborate that the presence of a good monarch exhibiting character virtue guarantees that this knowledge is used correctly for a social and collective end, rather than for the individual gain that a tyrant would seek. But given the collapse of the distinction between public and private in a monarchical state, the monarch’s private affairs encompass the communal, so that they ‘attend to public matters . . . as if they were private’ (τοῖς κοινοῖς . . . οἱ δ’ ὥς ἰδίῳι προσέχουσι τὸν νοῦν, 21).

Isocrates thus combines the principles of geometric equality with those of character assessment and an emphasis on individual virtue, with the novel twist that these provide justification for monarchy. He develops a distinctive argument for monarchy which does rest on tradition, and which integrates the monarchy into the political framework of the polis. Structuring the relations between citizens is a primary goal of any system of political ordering. While the presence of the king in the polis is paradoxical for Aristotle and others, Isocrates provides an argument which defuses the paradox.

This argument also develops a clear separation between the kind of kingship Isocrates values, and the tyranny of the ‘despotic template’. In a tyranny, we might not expect any graduated or hierarchical distribution, but a winner-takes-all model in favour of the tyrant. Isocrates’ pragmatism therefore delivers an objective basis for a distinction between kingship and tyranny, in which the evaluation of types of single-person rule is not mere personal preference or value judgement, as in Hobbes’ response to the good–bad constitutions divide.²⁴

The idea of geometric equality as the basis of just distribution according to individual merit is familiar in fourth-century thought, a recurring theme in the *Cyropaedia*, featured in the *Laws*, and central to Aristotle's ethical and political thought.²⁵ When Xenophon explores the distribution of reward within the hierarchical structure of Cyrus' army, Cyrus' geometric equality has a redistributive purpose that aims to motivate the troops. Aristotle will make geometric equality fundamental to the operation of the polis, although he identifies it as an oligarchic method of distribution, compared with the democratic form of arithmetic equality.²⁶ Isocrates elsewhere attributes the use of geometric equality to the (democratic) ancestral constitution of Athens (*Areopagiticus* 21–2), which inherits the qualities of monarchy through Theseus' mild character (*Helen* 37).²⁷ This manoeuvre enables Isocrates to incorporate monarchy into his polis model and apply it to Athens. For Isocrates, monarchy guarantees just, geometric distribution according to merit, through the judgement of the rational and knowledgeable monarch who discriminates and rewards appropriately.

Isocrates' repeated claim for monarchy is that it is 'milder' (πραότεραν, 16; πραότερα, 17, cf. 32) than other constitutions, because it only has to please the *nous* of one man rather than 'multitudinous varied desires' (πολλαῖς καὶ παντοδαπαῖς διανοίαις, 16).²⁸ This contrasts the unity or ordered whole of monarchy with the disorder of other regimes, the rational individual, whose temperament is stable, against the democratic beast, with its unpredictable changes of mood.²⁹ An individual will reliably exhibit his characteristic qualities, whereas a multitude is subject to changeability.

With the ontological claim for monarchy established, Nicocles then provides a list of the practical advantages for the polis of command by a single ruler (17–21): experience through long-term office-holding, compared with the brief rotations in and out of power experienced in democracies (17–18), lack of neglect of duty through the assumption that others are performing it (18), lack of the damaging effects of political competition between individuals in oligarchies and democracies (18), office-holders' ability to focus on public issues rather than private competition and debate (19), goodwill throughout the lifetime tenure of office (20) and, most importantly, the better ability of a monarch to devote his own capabilities and those of well-chosen advisers to affairs of state (21). As a group, these advantages present the greater efficiencies of the short chain of command provided by monarchy compared with the inefficient and lengthy processes of deliberation and disagreement in constitutions where action must be decided by communal deliberation; the superior epistemic status of the ruler benefits the whole society, exemplifying the opposite of Aristotle's wisdom of the multitude.³⁰

One significant advantage of using the keen monarchical mind is that it is easier for monarchs to recognise the *kairos*, the moment of opportunity for right action, and act upon it. The individual ruler's personal concern with affairs of state, as a complete whole, is superior to the partial interest of the few or the many (19). So the collapse of the distinction between public and private, which is one of the defects of tyranny, becomes a benefit under a good king, because the knowledge

of the individuals within the community is correctly used and distributed (21). Isocrates here theorises claims which are also evident in Herodotus' model, especially his account of Deioeces.

Monarchy is also presented as a particularly efficient form of military command, a line of thought that would develop in Athenian oratory.³¹ Here the problem that Xenophon has in separating generalship and kingship, also treated by Plato in the *Statesman*, re-emerges in Isocrates' account (22–4). Tyrannical single rule, such as that of Dionysius I of Syracuse, can also be counted under this heading as an example of an effective military campaign that resulted in renewed success for his state (23).³² Spartan and Carthaginian military success depends on the effective suspension of their oligarchic constitutions when the king takes to the battlefield with sole and absolute command (24). Isocrates suggests that Sparta is more successful when its rulers exert kingly authority on campaign; for him, mixed constitutions are more successful when circumstances dictate that the monarchical element should predominate.³³ Even for Athens, battles and campaigns fought under sole command (δι' ἐνός, 24) are more successful than those with multiple generals participating.

With his final claim for monarchy, Isocrates appears to slide away from his rationalising claims for monarchy, as the vehicle for just distribution in the community, and back towards politico-metaphysical claims about the advantages of the sole ruler as the embodiment of the unity of the whole and the link between cosmic and human order. 'The gods are ruled by Zeus as a monarch' (λέγεται καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ὑπὸ Διὸς βασιλεύεσθαι, 26), and so monarchy must be the best form of government to imitate or instantiate the divine *politeia*. But the use of a λέγεται ('it is said . . .') construction, familiar from source citations in historiography, distances Nicocles from the thought expressed; he may not concur with this conventional view.³⁴ Isocrates does not need this older argument for kingship; his argument that the virtuous monarch turns the features of tyranny into beneficial kingship already serves as a replacement for it. But by closing this section with an invocation of more traditional, ontological arguments for monarchy, he invokes the cosmic associations of kingship, making its surplus meaning explicit, to soften the more paradoxical claims made earlier about the benefits brought by kings using methods more often associated with tyranny.

The qualities of the king

With the advantages of monarchy identified, Isocrates goes on to show how they are embodied in the person of the king and instantiated in his actions. Isocrates' virtue model of monarchy places a heavy burden on the figure on the king, who must demonstrate qualities that mark him as virtuous and clearly distinct from both the tyrant and those whom he rules. This is more than the inversion of the 'despotic template' described by Luraghi; the personal qualities Nicocles needs and exemplifies support his claim to kingship.³⁵ However, Isocrates includes both the parallel with the gods noted above, and Nicocles' ancestral claim to inherited authority through his genealogy.

A typical authority claim made by kings is descent from a culture hero, and Nicocles opens with a brief account of his ancestor Teucer as ‘founder of our people’ (ὁ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἀρχηγός, 28), founder of the city and distributor of its land.³⁶ This story would be well-known to the audience Isocrates imagines for Nicocles’ speech, just as Spartan crown prince Archidamus can rely on his audience’s knowledge of Spartan mythical history (*Archidamus* 16–21); the *Evagoras* contains a more elaborate account of Salaminian foundation myth (*Evag.* 12–20). However, while the appeal to the mythical past is an important component of Isocratean argument, here it is deemed insufficient, and a replacement set of criteria for assessing the worth of a monarch is offered so that Nicocles can increase the respect he is accorded ‘not only because of [his] ancestors but on his own account’ (οὐ μόνον διὰ τοὺς προγόνους ἀλλὰ καὶ δι’ ἑμαυτόν, *Nic.* 29).

Whereas one might expect an Aristotelian theory of virtue monarchy to include some definition of virtue, here there is little exploration of the underlying ethical arguments, but rather a brief and conventional list of virtuous characteristics. Isocrates, as Alexiou has argued, works with what he often describes as an ‘agreed’ account of the good or of virtue.³⁷ Nicocles identifies the virtues of justice (δικαιοσύνην) and temperance (σωφροσύνην) as important qualities by which he should be assessed (29–30).³⁸ He supports this claim with the view that acts accompanied by these virtues are ‘greatly beneficial for human life’ (πολλὰ τὸν βίον τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὠφελοῦσας, 30), a typically utilitarian assessment. Although Isocrates appears to assume that *eudaimonia* is an intrinsic good, his conception of it as voiced by Nicocles is focused on material benefits; Nicocles will speak of bestowing gifts on his subjects and other Greeks (35).

Nicocles first offers evidence that he is just, giving an account of his re-establishment of stability and material prosperity in Salamis after his accession (31–2), and again showing a focus on the material and on distributive justice. The royal treasury was empty on his accession, and he had to budget carefully to restore his resources; he displayed justice in resisting the temptation to refill his treasury by unjust means, and so avoided corruption. A pair of result clauses describe his attitude to the community and its citizens; he behaved firstly ‘so that I might omit no action which had the potential for generating increase (ἀξιεθῆναι), and might grant prosperity (εὐδαιμονίαν) to the city’, and secondly, act ‘so mildly’ towards the citizens that none were disadvantaged or harmed as individuals (32). This asserts a necessary association of kingship and increase, as the consequence of political unification and the initiation of the positive phase of the political cycle. Nicocles positions himself both as an inheritor of rule and as the founder of a new phase of political order, despite the difficult beginning of his reign, as he sought to re-establish both his rule and the fortunes of the city while trapped between warring Greeks and a ‘truculent’ (τραχέως ἔχοντος) Great King (33).

A further sign of Nicocles’ just nature is his lack of the tyrannical *pleonexia*, seizing societal increase for personal benefit; he describes how he rejected the acquisitive policies of most rulers and did not expand his territory (34). Nicocles has behaved justly to his own citizens and to other Greeks, although again the report of his difficult relationship with the Great King suggests that he was not

entirely autonomous here.³⁹ Elsewhere, Isocrates draws a conventional portrait of a greedy tyrant; the Phoenician tyrant displaced by Evagoras was ‘clever at profiting’ (δαινὸς δὲ πρὸς τὸ πλεονεκτῆσαι, *Evag.* 19). The virtues of the king are opposed to the vices of the tyrant, with moderation and restraint, rather than greed, the key values.

Isocrates develops an alternative to the ‘despotic template’ model of tyranny with his discussion of the ruler’s personal life (36–7). In that model, greed and lack of self-control are often displayed through abusive sexual behaviour; Xenophon’s Hiero, in pointing out the dissatisfaction that ensues from easily acquired pleasures, underscores the traditional model (*Xen. Hiero* 1.26–30).⁴⁰ The despotic template also collapses the household and the polis, requiring that the same values be applied in each; this is re-engineered in the closing argument of Isocrates’ discussion of personal morality, in which the maintenance of civic order is linked to that of domestic order (41). Those ruling correctly must preserve *homonoia* both at the civic level and within their own household (these may have been conflated); these are the tasks of virtue and temperance.

The display of temperance goes ‘further’ (μεῖζω, 36) than the public display of justice that Nicocles has outlined, and is attested by *enkrateia*; Nicocles notes the importance placed on this by all (male heads of households). Since he became king he has not had sexual intercourse (σώματι πεπλησιακῶς) with anyone, male or female, but his own wife (τῆς ἑμαντοῦ γυναικός, 36), and so is safe from criticism on the grounds of sexual incontinence.⁴¹ Other kings may be regarded as just in their public role, despite delinquency in this aspect of their personal lives (37), but this is insufficient for Nicocles; he believes that his own behaviour should be beyond criticism, and also regards it as the duty of the king to act as an example for the other citizens (ἅμα δὲ παράδειγμα καταστήσαι τὸν τρόπον τὸν ἑμαντοῦ τοῖς ἄλλοις πολίταις, 37), because subjects look to their rulers to model their habits. Sexual desire is the most difficult desire to control (39), often defeating even those who display *enkrateia* in other aspects of their lives, so by demonstrating self-control in this respect Nicocles can emphasise his superiority both to his subjects and to other rulers.⁴² He wishes to be better than those who ‘pride themselves on their virtue’ (τῶν ἐπ’ ἀρετῇ μέγα φρονούντων, 39).

That the king is a moral exemplar for his subjects to copy, and thus enables them to achieve *eudaimonia*, is the central claim of Isocrates’ theory of virtue monarchy, but here given a pragmatic twist.⁴³ There is a practical payoff to acting as a moral exemplar; it provides a means of establishing the distance between ruler and ruled that befits kingship (43). It will not be possible for the majority of subjects to copy Nicocles fully; while some virtues (such as courage and cleverness) can be achieved by men who are bad in other respects, ‘justice and temperance are the private possessions of gentlemen (*kaloi kagathoi*)’ (τὴν δὲ δικαιοσύνην καὶ σωφροσύνην ἴδια κτήματα τῶν καλῶν κάγαθῶν ὄντα, 43). So Nicocles’ achievements cannot be copied by the majority of his subjects, and displaying his virtue sets him apart from them.⁴⁴ This perspective is the opposite of Protagoras’ democracy-friendly model of a common political skill shared by all (*Pl. Prt.* 323ac).

Furthermore, Nicocles has made a careful and ‘conscious’ (ταῦτα διανοηθείς, 44) choice (‘I have chosen’, προειλόμην) to act more carefully than others do, so that he also exemplifies a distinctive ability to choose (*prohairesis*); the emphasis on monarchical distance in the speech suggests that this is distinctive from the deliberation of ordinary citizens in democratic Athens.⁴⁵ Citizens should certainly imitate the example given in the speech, but they can only do so to a limited extent that does not equate to them becoming monarchs. In a Platonic model of mimesis, imitation will always result in an imperfect copy; Isocrates seems to imply this but does not argue it.⁴⁶ However, the imperfection of imitators further establishes the distinction being made between the king as *paradeigma* and his copyists.

Good kingship, Nicocles concludes, is produced by the powerful man who chooses virtue over vice, in circumstances which would otherwise generate tyranny (44–5). The private advantages of these qualities are then distributed to the monarch’s subjects, benefiting the collective; while tyranny is at best a zero-sum game always won by the tyrant, in Isocrates’ kingship model the benefits generated by the ruler and ruled working together are shared across society, in proportion with the worth of its members as recognised by the ruler.⁴⁷

But Nicocles’ problem is that, although he properly exemplifies all the relevant virtues, his people are failing to reciprocate and perform their tasks ‘justly and with appropriate concern’ (ἐπιμελῶς καὶ δικαίως, 48). He describes the contribution expected of citizens in this model. Here it becomes clear that certain responsible citizens play a different role in passing on the virtuous qualities valued in this model. In their protreptic roles as educators and heads of households, citizens should ‘demonstrate’ (ὑποδεικνύοντες) these qualities in their own actions (57); but what they are demonstrating is their ability to pass down the virtue they have recognised in their ruler. They will not, like Nicocles himself, become originary *paradeigmata*, but should demonstrate behaviour that transmits his virtue. A hierarchy is established through which decreasing amounts of virtue cascade.

The outcome of mutually directed good behaviour from the citizens and king will be a continuing ‘increase in rule’ (τὴν ἀρχὴν . . . ἡϋξημένην) paralleled by continuing *eudaimonia* for the polis (τὴν πόλιν εὐδαιμόνα γεγενημένην, 63). Both king and subjects must play their part for this condition to be satisfied.⁴⁸ In this respect, Isocrates’ model of kingship contains participatory elements that show how it might be embedded within polis structures.

Isocrates is careful to present this claim for the role of monarchy within the polis in a setting clearly distinct from Athens, and one that holds no political threat to that city. He never suggests that Athens should become a monarchy in any other sense than through the continuing influence of Theseus’ example on the city, instantiated in its political imaginary and civic cult rather than its political institutions. Although, as seen in Chapter 3, he offers Theseus as a model for Philip of Macedon to imitate, this is as an absent monarch who handed over government of the city to its inhabitants. Isocrates can equate the external rule of a king to the continuing presence of mythical kings in the political imaginary, providing a route by which monarchy and democracy could be accommodated and the paradox of monarchy in the polis solved.

Evagoras, myth and history

Isocrates takes a different generic approach in examining ideas of kingship through the life of Nicocles' father Evagoras, writing a prose encomium which, like the funeral speech and the local histories of Athens, incorporates elements of foundation myth and recent events into a single literary structure. The *Evagoras* translates the types of praise typically reserved for mythical founder figures into the encomium of a recognisably historical individual, the kind of rhetorical novelty in narrating events that Isocrates described in his *Panegyricus* (*Paneg.* 8).⁴⁹ It describes a historical figure, probably (in winning rather than inheriting rule) more accurately classified as a tyrant than a king, as if he were a mythical king of the stature of Theseus.⁵⁰ Evangelos Alexiou has suggested that this encomium is in dialogue with the traditions of the Athenian funeral speech, and that Isocrates' deliberate *praeteritio* of mythical events in favour of narrating the recent historical past parallels Thucydides' Pericles' omission of typical components of the funeral speech, including the mythical deeds of the Athenians from his Funeral Speech (Thuc. 2.35.1–2).⁵¹ But Isocrates' inclusion of the elements of genealogy (12–20) and cosmic portents (21) provide a backup allusion to the traditional grounds of monarchical excellence, genealogical connection to the divine and special treatment from the divine, while going on to explore the possession of character virtues and the excellent deeds they enable.

The example of the virtue monarch also has an important protreptic function (77), in this case the education of Evagoras' son Nicocles, who is to be inspired by *paradeigmata* from his own family history. Isocrates argues that stories of real human achievement are more effective as protreptic than fictions; however, verse rather than prose is more attractive to listeners and will even 'bewitch' (ψυχαγωγούσι, *Evagoras* 10).⁵² Many scholars have explored the literary and formal experimentation of the *Evagoras* as a development in rhetorical and literary practice, as Isocrates' introduction and epilogue invite the reader to do, but the political implications of the model of virtue monarchy and its transmission between generations, and Isocrates' analysis of the causes of Evagoras' success, has received less attention.⁵³

Isocrates argues that the willingness of writers to praise mythological figures acts as a disincentive to the young by placing the finest achievements out of the reach of historical figures (5–7); he goes on to observe that 'it is difficult to do what I am going to do, to praise a man's virtue in prose' (χαλεπὸν ἐστὶν ὃ μέλλω ποιεῖν, ἀνδρὸς ἀρετὴν διὰ λόγων ἐγκωμιάζειν, 8). This formal challenge to his own compositional abilities opens up a comparison between the work as evidence of Isocrates' compositional skill, alongside the deeds of Evagoras that illustrate his virtue. In assessing Evagoras' deeds through Isocrates' retelling, listeners and readers will also be assessing Isocrates' literary skill.

Isocrates' self-conscious formalism is matched by that of the most obvious comparator for the *Evagoras*, Xenophon's encomiastic portrait of the Spartan king Agesilaus, which also begins with a disclaimer of the author's skills (*Agesilaus* 1.1).⁵⁴ This short biography can be read alongside the *Evagoras* as a portrait of

virtue monarchy, and covers similar terrain, but brings the subject of praise closer to the mainstream Greek world and to Athenian political discourse and Socratic virtue ethics. Agesilaus' rule rests on his virtue, which provides a paradigm for his subjects, or 'those of them who wish to practise manly virtue' (τοῖς ἀνδραγαθίαν ἀσκεῖν βουλομένοις, 10.2) to imitate, in order to become sensible (σώφρονα), just (δίκαιον) and self-controlled (ἐγκρατῆ). Xenophon represents him as holding a Socratic vision of ruling; 'He thought it the work of the good king, to make those he ruled as good as possible' (βασιλέως ἀγαθοῦ τοῦτο ἔργον ἐνόμιζε, τὸ τοὺς ἀρχομένους ὡς πλεῖστα ἀγαθὰ ποιεῖν, 7.1). Xenophon has the further advantage over Isocrates that his model of virtue is theorised in his Socratic works.⁵⁵

Isocrates' encomium tackles the distinction between myth and idealised exemplum, rather than that between history and ideal negotiated by Xenophon. The first narrative section of the speech, recounting Evagoras' mythical ancestry, establishes Evagoras' connection with the Greek world as a descendant of Salaminian Ajax' brother Teucer (*Evag.* 12–20).⁵⁶ Isocrates asserts that Evagoras' claim to praise rests not on genealogy or myth, but on his own deeds (65–6), superior to those of both mythical predecessors (the Greek forces at Troy, 65) and historical ones (Cyrus, 37–9).

However, after establishing the mythical background, Isocrates switches direction sharply when he reaches the object of his encomium. In recounting Evagoras' childhood he uses *praeteritio* to allude to supernatural portents, while disdaining the narration of their details, a contrast to the emphasis on the supernatural in the early lives of Herodotus' kings and tyrants: 'I choose to pass over those events from which he might seem to be of greater than human birth' (ἐξ ὧν μαιζόνως ἂν φανεῖν γεγόνως ἢ κατ' ἄνθρωπον, αἰροῦμαι παραλιπεῖν, 21).⁵⁷

Instead, Isocrates will concentrate on the way his subject exemplifies the virtues of 'beauty, strength and sense' (κάλλος καὶ ῥώμην καὶ σωφροσύνην, 22). The list of individual virtues builds through the narrative sections to create a portrait of a man with the greatness of character that fits him for rule. In narrating Evagoras' story, Isocrates presents an account of Evagoras' 'magnificence/greatness of soul', *megalopsuchia* (3), that does not depend on his illustrious ancestry.⁵⁸

He goes on to praise the political achievements of Evagoras in regaining control of Salamis (in c. 411 BCE) from Phoenician conquerors, who had turned it into a 'barbarian city' (πόλιν ἐκβεβαρβαρωμένην, 47), resulting in a loss of 'craft knowledge' (τέχνας ἐπισταμένην). While there is a clear implication in the earlier account that this was a messy business, Evagoras is said to have remained separate from the political fray, and his virtue was not compromised by the pursuit of power. Here Isocrates does hint at divine assistance; 'a *daimon* had such forethought for him, that he might take the kingship (βασίλειαν) honourably, that any preparations which required impiety (ἀσεβείας) were committed by others' (25–6). But establishing the quality of Evagoras' rule and character, however it is labelled, is important for Isocrates' presentation.⁵⁹

The contrast with Cyrus the Great, made explicit later, becomes a vehicle for this analysis (37–9); there is a shift between the genres with which Isocrates engages, from the mythical discourse of sophistic encomium to the historical discourse of

Herodotus. Isocrates uses sources for his account of Cyrus distinct from those of Herodotus; he cites Cyrus' killing of his grandfather as evidence of impiety (38); this contradicts Herodotus' account (1.131) but is perhaps alluded to by Aristotle.⁶⁰ The differences between Isocrates', Xenophon's and other accounts of Cyrus demonstrate the usefulness of this Persian figure as a locus for Greek political debate.⁶¹

Isocrates uses the language of kingship and tyranny carefully in this speech. Evagoras is identified as *turannos*, rather than *basileus* (32), but this is because he seizes rule from a tyrant (31); his family's ancestral rule was 'kingship' (βασιλείαν, 19, 20), as is his once established (25).⁶² Isocrates identifies Evagoras' rule as good because it attracts good-quality Greeks who prefer his kingly rule to their home constitutions, 'on the grounds that Evagoras' kingly rule [was] less oppressive and more lawful than their home constitutions', (ἡγούμενοι κουφοτέραν καὶ νομιωτέραν εἶναι τὴν Εὐαγόρου βασιλείαν τῶν οἰκοι πολιτειῶν, 51). This claim perhaps overlooks the political and contingent domestic reasons why a series of Athenian *kaloikagathoi* wished to relocate to his city.⁶³

Isocrates further emphasises the kingly quality of Evagoras' rule when he summarises his impact. The closing section contrasts tyranny with kingship: 'he was worthy of holding power (τυραννεῖν) over not only Salamis but the whole of Asia, and acquired his kingship (βασιλείαν) in a most honourable way and kept it throughout his life' (71). He also praises Evagoras for the royal status achieved and maintained by his children (72), who include Nicocles, the addressee of the work.⁶⁴

The *Nicocles* and the *Evagoras* are central to Isocrates' political and ethical thought, and to his stress on the personal qualities of the leading individual, and on the importance of such individuals as models for imitation.⁶⁵ The *Evagoras* makes explicit the process of apparent historicisation, paralleling that which Isocrates uses when discussing Athenian monarchy, which results in the production of an exemplar that can be imitated by potential rulers. Isocrates establishes virtue as a qualification for rule alongside the military and political successes that bring power, and a driver of political stability, a theme that Aristotle develops in the *Politics*. But Xenophon took this process further even than Isocrates, with his exploration of monarchy through the story of Cyrus the Elder. Rather than focus on a limited case of marginal significance, Xenophon tackles the central case of the imperial founder and Great King of Persia.

Xenophon and virtue monarchy: the *Cyropaedia*

Xenophon uses a model of virtue monarchy in the *Cyropaedia* as part of a subtle and complex exploration of the problem of expanding the authority of the virtue monarch beyond the small-scale polis or *ethnos*-state court into a large, multiethnic empire. While Xenophon praised Sparta's Agesilaus in terms of virtue kingship, his portrait of Cyrus enables him to explore the difficulties inherent in 'scaling up' rule from polis to empire, and how that might affect the role of the king as a *paradeigma*.⁶⁶ The work is a major source for its author's thought on military leadership, monarchy and imperialism, revealing the tension between utility and virtue faced by leaders and rulers, and that between Xenophon's experience of Persia and

his orientalisising tendencies.⁶⁷ Its dialogues and arguments relate both Xenophon's Socratic works, and to developments in political thought seen in Plato's *Statesman*, such as the concept of the *kairos*, the opportune moment for action. Recognition of the *kairos* is a key attribute of successful generals and rulers, and the narrative of the *Cyropaedia* shows Cyrus' ability at such recognition developing with his experience.⁶⁸ The good king's epistemological status is also distinct in his capacity to ensure the correct distribution of goods and rewards.

Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* provides one of the most detailed analyses of kingship as a source of political stability within the Greek discourse of kingship. Although much recent commentary has read this as a psychological portrait of leadership, there are questions of political ontology both in the exploration of scale and in the identification of difference between ruler and rule, as Xenophon seeks to explain what made Cyrus distinct from other rulers in his success at ruling other men (*Cyr.* 1.1.3–5) and whether this success was due to nature or nurture (1.1.6). In using the established, though contested, figure of Cyrus, Xenophon engages with other accounts of his life, including those from Herodotus and (probably) Antisthenes.⁶⁹ The figure of the 'great king' of Persia exercised considerable fascination for Athenians as a general model for exploring issues of leadership and authority, beyond the local interest in the specific deeds of notorious examples such as Xerxes. Xenophon's travels had given him firsthand exposure both to the monarchy itself and the institutions and practices through which it maintained power.⁷⁰

Although Xenophon's initial questions are general and theoretical ones, they should guide the reader in using the examples he provides in the *Cyropaedia*. However, reading the *Cyropaedia* for its political theory content is difficult, because the work is so unusual in its style and structure, mixing narrative and dialogue, history and fiction, within a work on the scale of epic and defying characterisation by genre.⁷¹ Xenophon uses the narrative structure of the work to contrast both the characters of individual leaders, and the societies they lead, with Cyrus and Persia. Much scholarship has followed earlier readings that incorporated the work into the political theory canon, notably Machiavelli, for whom Xenophon's Cyrus was a prime example.⁷²

Xenophon, along with Plato, used Socratic dialogue to examine the concept of an art of kingship, although both writers struggled to define it in their earlier works. Plato would go on to deliver an answer in the *Statesman*, not in Socrates' voice, while the *Cyropaedia* represents Xenophon's fullest answer, in an different genre than the Socratic dialogue.⁷³ Through the story of Cyrus' education, military campaigns and consolidation of rule over many subject states, Xenophon outlines the excellences that a good leader should show in a range of contexts, particularly military ones. The nature of kingship and of monarchical regimes is a constant theme, from the opening analysis through the sections set in Persia, Media and the borders of Assyria. But the most careful analysis of kingship comes in the final section of the work, at the point when Cyrus consolidates his rule and chooses to represent himself as a king using the spectacle and performance of Median kingship (7.5.37–8.8).⁷⁴

One strand of scholarship on the *Cyropaedia* interprets the Persia of the opening book as a republic, eventually to be replaced by Cyrus' (despotic) empire; the interpretative problems then centre around the deceitful character of Cyrus, and Xenophon's limited criticism of his model.⁷⁵ This binary opposition seems mistaken, if we examine the relationship between Persia and Cyrus' empire in detail; Xenophon differentiates varied types of leadership within forms of single-person rule through his narrative, much as Aristotle does in the *Politics*. The characters of the *Cyropaedia*, especially leaders such as Cyrus' relatives Cambyses, the Persian constitutional king, Astyages, the Median despot, and Cyaxares, the weak military leader, provide a gallery of leadership types from whom Cyrus will be distinguished by features and actions that position him as a king not as a tyrant. Xenophon's other narrative works provide similar series of exemplars, from the Athenian politicians of the *Hellenica* and the constitutions they represent, to the generals of the *Anabasis* and their distinctive leadership styles. The tribal kings of the *Cyropaedia* present a further series, but one in which the prime contrast will always be with Cyrus as the ideal.⁷⁶

Xenophon's analysis is complex and perhaps inconclusive; it is too simplistic to see him valuing the earlier, smaller 'republican' Persia over the later despotic empire created by Cyrus' conquests.⁷⁷ He points to the problems of rule and leadership in the different scales of social organisation, and considers whether Cyrus' military skill, so well-fitted to Persian leadership, translates to the kingly skill that Cyrus believes is required for ruling a large-scale empire.

Persians and Medes

The first two societies depicted are Cyrus' paternal country, Persia, and his mother's home, the country of the Medes. Xenophon's representation of Persian social and political structures in his 'Persian *politeia*' (*Cyr.* 1.2.2–16) draws on ideas familiar from Laconising accounts of ideal constitutions, even his own *Lacedaemonion Politeia*.⁷⁸ Xenophon's Persia is not simply Sparta in orientalised dress, but it occupies a similar space to an idealised Sparta in typologies of constitutions; if anything, it resembles Plato's Magnesia (*Laws* V–XII), with the significant difference of a king who is subject to the law, like Aristotle's Spartan kings.⁷⁹ It is a small-scale society where individuals know each other, much like a Greek polis, and leaders can demonstrate their abilities directly to their subordinates. It is also a society that values participation, deliberation and discussion (1.2.12–14, 1.4.3). Although Xenophon draws on historical features of non-Greek societies, especially Persia, many of the societies presented in the *Cyropaedia* are imaginary constructions, their details, and the distinctions between them, arranged to illuminate his arguments.⁸⁰ Like Herodotus' account of the Medes under Deioces, this model society provides a starting point for analysing the developments that are the main focus of the narrative.

The various *ethnos* states of the *Cyropaedia* each represents a type of single-person rule, and their rulers exhibit a range of deficiencies, but the contrast between Medes and Persians is particularly important.⁸¹ Both social structure and

leadership style differentiate these states; while Persia has a mixed constitution in which Cambyses rules within the law, Media offers an orientalist exploration of the potential for good rule within the 'despotic template'. The differences between these states, and the way Cyrus interacts with Median leaders, have occupied Straussian commentators who locate within these episodes the source of Cyrus' tyrannical characteristics; Waller Newell argues that exposure to Median despotism seeds the desire to 'overthrow the republic' of Persia.⁸²

As the son of Persia's leader, Cyrus occupies a privileged position in its educational structure; Xenophon examines this education as one of the three potential causes of Cyrus' success: 'we investigated what his ancestry (*γενεάν*) was, what kind of nature (*φύσιν*) he had and what education (*παιδεία*) he had had, that resulted in him differing so much at ruling people (*τὸ ἄρχειν ἀνθρώπων*)' (1.1.6). Cyrus passes through the system despite his lengthy absences among the Medes, significant in an age-class system.⁸³ The subsequent dialogue sections (1.3–6) demonstrate what Cyrus has learned and has still to learn from Persian society, as he comes under the competing influence of his Median maternal grandfather Astyages. These dialogues are already focused on Cyrus' difference from those whose lives are lived completely within the structures of Persian society, and open the question as to whether Cyrus will maintain Persian values while living in a different society.

In Astyages' court, access to the king is tightly controlled by his cup-bearer, Sacas.⁸⁴ The young Cyrus struggles with the rigid court protocols, which conflict with both his nature and his Persian education (1.4.3–4). This short section maps the differences of deliberative Persia and absolutist Media on to Cyrus' personal development; the once 'rather talkative' (*πολυλογώτερος*, 1.4.3) boy becomes a 'more quiet' (*ἡσυχαιότερος*, 1.4.4) adult, maintaining distance and the values of quietism rather than puppyish eagerness to interact with all.

Firstly, Cyrus discusses justice with his mother Mandane (1.3.15–18).⁸⁵ Mandane's astute political analysis suggests that Xenophon follows Herodotus in granting royal women a privileged epistemic standpoint. Mandane's concern about Cyrus' experience among the Medes, and the possibility that it will encourage him into tyranny and injustice, raises the key political question of the work as a whole: Can Cyrus continue to be just, in the Greek sense of acting within the law, when he has become accustomed to the exercise of will of his Median grandfather Astyages' rule, which is tyranny? Mandane is clear that there is a binary opposition between *basilikon* Persian and *turannikon* Median rule, and that Cyrus risks becoming acculturated within the latter. She uses two criteria, equality and the subjection of the ruler to the law (1.3.18), to distinguish the two political cultures, and equates the Median culture with the tyrannical; the ruler is outside the law, and distribution is entirely in his favour, so that he has more than all. But Cyrus confirms his opposition to *pleonexia*, although he equates Astyages' control over resources with the positive acquisition of self-restraint by the impoverished Medians.

Secondly, Cyrus discusses military leadership and ruling with his father Cambyses, establishing many themes of the middle books.⁸⁶ Cambyses is concerned to pass on both values and practical advice, so that Cyrus will manage

his relationships with both gods and men appropriately. Due and Gera both note that religious matters frame this dialogue (1.6.2–6, 44–6) and that the favourable omens described add to this religious framing.⁸⁷ The figure of the king has a special connection to the divine, and Cambyse's closing speech emphasises that this delivers a unique quality of knowledge. Knowledge of the divine, he argues, distinguishes men who 'guess' (εικάζοντες) from men who 'know' (εἰδότες, 44), and human ability to choose is no better than the random choice of the lot (46). While the gods are under no compulsion to help all (46), we can infer from the positive omens of 'thunderclaps and lightning strikes' (ἄστραπαὶ καὶ βρονταί, 1.6.1) that precede the dialogue that the gods are taking an interest in Cyrus.

But education remains complex. Education for leadership is different in that good leaders must learn to deceive their troops, something the young Cyrus finds counter-intuitive; leaders must behave differently from the led.⁸⁸ The good leader must learn to manage the expectations of those he leads, in order to maintain morale (19), and this may require him to deceive them. Cambyse explains this through hunting metaphors, in which troops are represented by hounds. The distinction between leader and led becomes one between that of different species, as in the image of the king as shepherd that Xenophon wraps around the story of Cyrus (1.1.2, 8.2.14). Again, the debate focuses on the distinction between leads and the led, with Cambyse representing a traditional, cosmic-religious view of what can make a king distinct from his people.

While the most important quality for a leader to manifest is being *phronimos*, even this is relative; the leader should be more *phronimos* than any rivals. The metaphor of the shorter road (1.6.21–2) and the appeal to the crafts analogy reinforce the Socratic resonances, although the 'shortcut' of accepting the ruler's wisdom is acceptable to Xenophon's characters in a way that it is not to Plato's.⁸⁹ Cambyse goes on to offer a non-intellectual conception of the *phronimos* (compared with that of Aristotle in *Nicomachean Ethics* VI); once Cyrus has reached the limits of what can be known, he should become more *phronimos* through successful divination (23). Cambyse's distinction between the *phronimos* and other leaders rests not on knowledge, but on differential access to the divine.

The framing of the discussion supports this view that Cyrus' superiority will not lie purely in human knowledge, but in a distinction from others implied by the gods' willingness to communicate with and to support him. He occupies a distinct space between his subjects and the divine. While Cambyse has outlined a range of moral qualities and practical behaviours that Cyrus should adopt, his success may not depend entirely on these practices but on his continuing positive relationship with the divine. Cambyse's analysis, for all its sophistic pragmatism on the use of deceit, rests on a highly traditional cosmology, but one that may prove insufficient at the scale of command which Cyrus will reach through conquest.

Cyrus on campaign

The central part of the *Cyropaedia* details Cyrus' military campaigns as a young adult, leading to his takeover of the Median forces and conquest of Babylon. This

narrative enables Xenophon to depict ideal military leadership. Several sub-plots, such as his relationships with his long-term subordinates, his rivalry with his uncle Cyaxares, his treatment of defeated rulers such as Croesus and the tragic story of the captive queen Pantheia, enable distinctive elements of the good leader to be emphasised; other characters' responses to Cyrus illustrate his personal magnetism and developing skill.⁹⁰

Cyrus' changing relationship with his Median uncle Cyaxares provides the main material for determining his development as a leader, as the balance of power shifts between them.⁹¹ When Cyrus returns to Media to support Cambyses' fight against the Assyrians (1.6.9–16), his uncle insists that Cyrus should be self-reliant, and their mutual wariness develops. On the campaign, Cyrus demonstrates his greater commitment to victory when he proposes to lead out a force against the fleeing Assyrians to cement the victory (4.1.10–11), while Cyaxares declines to leave his dinner party. He suggests that Cyrus' pursuit of victory is 'immoderate' (ἀπλήστως, 4.1.14), opposed to 'self-restrained' (ἐγκρατῆ, 14) and 'moderate' (σωφρόνως, 4.1.15); this inversion of values invites the reader to make their own assessment.

Xenophon sets out two opposing positions: Cyrus' commitment to maximising the opportunity of the *kairos*, and Cyaxares' rejection of extreme emotion and his suspicion that both Medes and Assyrians will fight in self-defence even if they do not wish to do so (4.1.17). Cyaxares' reluctance to leave his feast is ambiguous; is it the moderation he claims, a demonstration of *enkrateia*, or a shirking of duty? Cyrus defuses his uncle's assertion about the wild self-defence of those who fight out of necessity not choice by asserting that he will only take volunteers from the Median camp (4.1.21). The opposition between compulsion and voluntarism is sharpened when the Median volunteers transfer their loyalty to Cyrus; Artabazus, Cyrus' boyhood admirer, is first to volunteer in support of the man he identifies as 'the most noble and best' (ἀνδρὸς καλλίστου καὶ ἀρίστου, 4.1.24) and 'descended from the gods', a reminder that Cyrus is a charismatic leader who attracts support (4.1.22–3).⁹² As Xenophon's Simonides suggests 'A kind of honour and favour, even from the gods, accompany the man who rules (ἀνδρὶ ἄρχοντι)' (*Hiero* 8.5).

Uncle and nephew debate the outcome of Cyrus' growing power over the Median forces at length, in a key scene (5.5.5–43) in which Cyaxares is forced to accept Cyrus' success.⁹³ Cyaxares complains that he has been feminised by the transfer of power, treated 'as a woman' (ὥσπερ γυνή, 5.5.33), a response to loss of power that will later be echoed by the defeated Croesus, and one that suggests a strong binary distinction between the possessor of power and its loser.⁹⁴ But his initial complaint is expressed in terms of his claim to kingship; Cyaxares would be ashamed to appear with a smaller retinue than Cyrus, when he himself 'is considered a king, and was born from a father who was king, and from ancient ancestors (τῶν πάλαι προγόνων) as far as the memory of men extends' reaches (5.5.8). This complaint engages the principle of proportional distribution, associated with the discourse of kingship. In Cyaxares' view, the relative power of each man is no longer correctly expressed by the proportional sizes of their retinue, but readers may feel that Cyrus' superior skill, and particularly his grasp of the all-important leadership criterion of the *kairos*, have justly gained him the larger

forces. Cyaxares would prefer oblivion to humiliation – he would ‘ten times rather sink down under the earth’ (δεκάκις ἂν κατὰ τῆς γῆς καταδύναι, 5.8.9), suggesting that loss of power is an existential threat to him.⁹⁵

Cyrus’ encounter with the defeated Croesus (7.2.9–29) also depicts his kingly qualities in comparison with a leader whose power is in decline, and gains structural importance through its links to the Herodotean *Logos of Croesus* and Croesus’ continuing role as advisor to Cyrus (Hdt. 1.88–90, 1.207). Just as in Herodotus’ version, the interactions between the victorious and the defeated leader contain crystallised political analysis that explains the important shift in the rise and fall of empires and their rulers. But Xenophon’s versions foreground ethical and religious claims to kingship, which will result in his Cyrus ending his life in happier circumstances than Herodotus’, butchered by the queen of the Massagetae (Hdt. 1.214, against *Cyr.* 8.7).⁹⁶

Their initial exchange sets the tone; Xenophon’s Croesus greets Cyrus as his ‘master’ (χαῖρε, ὦ δέσποτα, 7.2.9), emphasising the relationship between conqueror and conquered, while Cyrus responds by invoking their shared humanity: ‘since both of us are in fact human beings’ (ἐπεὶ περ ἄνθρωποι γέ ἐσμεν ἀμφοτέρω, 10).⁹⁷ He then asks for advice, as if he were invoking the Herodotean Croesus and Cyrus too.

Croesus’ advice is delivered in two sections, replaying the practical and religious elements of Herodotus’ version.⁹⁸ But whereas Herodotus’ Croesus points to the self-interest of Cyrus in preventing the plunder of Sardis (1.88.2–3), Xenophon’s Croesus makes a more sophisticated appeal. Cyrus has already expressed his concern that plunder enriches (πλεονεκτήσειαν) the worst (7.2.11); as an unjust distribution it exemplifies *pleonexia*. Croesus confirms that Cyrus’ role is to protect the ability of his subjects to practise their skills and generate prosperity – these would be lost if the city were plundered (7.2.13). He confirms that the Lydians will voluntarily (παρ’ ἐκόντων Λυδῶν, 7.2.12) submit to handing over their goods. Thus the principles of kingship, accuracy in distributive justice and rule over voluntary subjects, are respected by Cyrus’ generous treatment of the conquered.

Xenophon’s Croesus, like Herodotus’, also shares his experience with oracles (7.2.15–24), retelling the story of how he had misunderstood oracles and failed to exhibit self-knowledge; success had reduced his capacity to know himself. Only the encounter with Cyrus caused Croesus to recognise that despite his pretensions he was not the ‘greatest’ of men (7.2.23).⁹⁹ But Croesus knows that Cyrus really is ‘the greatest’, for reasons that summarise the features of Xenophontic kingship and the exploration of *eudaimonia*.¹⁰⁰ Cyrus is ‘descended from gods’ (ἐκ θεῶν γεγονότι), ‘born from kings’ (διὰ βασιλέων πεφυκότι), and has ‘practised virtue from childhood’ (ἐκ παιδὸς ἀρετὴν ἀσκοῦντι, 24). Croesus’ descent from the freedman Gyges (7.2.24), in contrast, counts against him.¹⁰¹ Xenophon here seems reluctant to present Cyrus’ claim to rule as purely established by his practice of virtue; the traditional claims of divine descent and genealogical proof are given equal importance, as they were when Artabazus chose to follow him (4.1.24).

The differentiation between ruler and ruled, conqueror and conquered, is gendered. Croesus recognises that Cyrus’ generosity to him means that his happiness

now will be the same as that formerly enjoyed by his wife (28); he will be the recipient of generosity with no capacity to reciprocate. In noting Cyrus' continuing suspicion of Croesus, Xenophon hints that this situation might cause bitterness (29). While Cyrus recognised Croesus as a fellow human, he treats him as a woman, depriving him of the opportunity for worthwhile labour (*ponos*), and thus the ability to generate his own *eudaimonia*, rather than receive it secondhand.¹⁰²

This discussion leads into the resolution of another sub-plot of the *Cyropaedia*, the story of Abradatas, another defeated king, and his devoted wife and queen Pantheia, who has become Cyrus' captive. This story explores Cyrus' *enkrateia* and the role of voluntarism in his kingship, and is tightly woven into the narrative and the work's broader political and ethical concerns, rather than simply being a romantic digression.¹⁰³ Cyrus places Pantheia in the care of his friend Araspas the Mede (5.1.2), believing that there is no risk of his friend succumbing to desire for his charge (5.1.9); Araspas indeed argues that sexual desire is no more difficult to manage than hunger, exhaustion or any other appetitive desire (11). Cyrus remains convinced that love is a form of slavery (12) and should be avoided – he avoids contact with Pantheia. Araspas, on the other hand, fails to master his attraction to Pantheia, and threatens her with rape (6.1.32); she demands that Cyrus provide her with the protection she is due.

Pantheia, however, exemplifies loyalty in her devotion to Abradatas, and in her friendship with Cyrus. After Abradatas' death in battle (7.1.29–32), she takes responsibility for his death; if she had not offered his support to Cyrus, he would not have gone out to fight. Cyrus praises her virtue and wisdom (7.3.12), while Pantheia expects Cyrus to understand her final message to him. There is a sense in which Pantheia represents aspects of Cyrus' character; that he values the qualities of both wife and husband is shown by the 'excessively large monument' (*μνημα ὑπερμέγεθες*, 7.3.16) he builds for them, another instance of the workings of geometric distribution (cf. 5.5.8–9). While Cyrus also uses Pantheia, her husband and Araspas, her would-be assailant, to further his own purposes, the relationship between Cyrus and Pantheia is one of respect; in terms of Aristotelian models of friendship, it approaches most clearly that of virtue friendship (*EN* 8.3.1156b7–33); both Cyrus and Pantheia can gain from contemplating each other's virtue.¹⁰⁴ This sophisticated analysis of friendship plays a significant role in Xenophon's analysis of Cyrus as king, and is distinct from the utilitarian perspective attributed to Socrates, where friendship is the most productive possession (*τοῦ δὲ παμφορωτάτου κτήματος*, *Mem.* 2.4.7).¹⁰⁵

Cyrus in victory

The final section of the *Cyropaedia* (7.5.37–8.7.28) shows the transformation of the victorious Cyrus into a full-scale king, transcending his previous status as a military leader and completing his *paideia*.¹⁰⁶ Xenophon underscores this by emphasising Cyrus' new mode of dress, living arrangements and political structure. Cyrus 'desires' this transformation (*ἐπιθυμῶν*, 7.5.37), but is governed by his simultaneous desire to remain within the structures of friendship and act with

their approval. The problems of combining the equal relation of friendship with the distance required between king and subject recur throughout this final part of the work, and are explored through the stories of Cyrus' subordinates and prisoners, Croesus, Pantheia and Pheraulas.

The aspect of kingship that Cyrus wishes to embody is distance from his subjects, to 'make his appearances rare and solemn (σπάνιός τε καὶ σεμνός), without attracting jealousy' (7.5.37). Just like Herodotus' Deioces (1.97–101), his instigation of court protocol and ritual is part of the creation of a new space, in Cyrus' case his new base in the ancient city of Babylon (7.5.55).¹⁰⁷ Just as Herodotus' narrative found Deioces' transition ambiguous, Xenophon's account neither condemns nor praises Cyrus.¹⁰⁸ The changes affect both Cyrus and his loyal friends the *homotimoi* ('men of equal honour') as their political environment transitions from the pseudo-polis of Persia (1.2) to the new imperial court (7.5.37–8.6.20).

Whether this new regime is *basilikos* or *turannikos* remains in question. The lessons of the intervening narratives of Croesus and Pantheia suggest that, although this is a finely balanced question, Cyrus is a king through both personal virtue and cosmic/divine support. But his rejection of equality and assumption of distance are problematic. Cyrus' display of virtue provides an exemplar that can be copied only by his Persian associates within the confines of court (8.1.23). If Cyrus disappears from view and operates as a king remotely from his subjects, it is difficult for him to be a direct *paradeigma* of virtue for any but his courtiers (8.1.39). Given that his new empire is different from the small polis of Salamis, in which Nicocles could exemplify virtue within sight of his subjects, the trickle-down effect which Nicocles suggested would need to work at greater distance and more levels in the vast new empire.¹⁰⁹ Defeated non-Persians and those outside the class of *homotimoi* are excluded from the possibility of direct imitation of Cyrus. But even for the *homotimoi*, while their imitation of Cyrus brings them 'more *eudaimonia*' (εὐδαιμονέστεροι, 24), it is the 'ruler who has the most *eudaimonia*' (ὁ εὐδαιμονέστατός τε ὢν καὶ ἄρχων).

The separation of king from friends is a significant element of this process, noted by Herodotus, and narrated at length by Xenophon, down to details such as their hasty departure to relieve themselves once Cyrus has spoken to them (40). The problem of kingship, friendship and equality will be addressed throughout this section, as the separation of Cyrus from his equals is one of the key political problems of the work. Cyrus' friendship can no longer be symmetrical, and generosity becomes a tool to subjugate his former friends as he lavishes rewards on them that they cannot return (8.2.13–14). Cyrus' behaviour could illustrate Aristotle's account of such friendships (*NE* 8.11.1161a11–14); it is also part of the process through which Cyrus controls his friends and demonstrates his superiority to them.¹¹⁰

Cyrus eventually gives access to his friends, so that he can brief them on the new regime and their intermediary place within society, part of the court but no longer equal to their ruler (42–7). He explains the difference between his role on campaign and as peace-time king in terms of 'knowledge' (τῷ εἰδέναι, 46). During war he must be accessible and able to gain swift understanding of events, in order

to manage the *kairos* (46). But now that war is over, its extreme demand for the leader's *ponos* (ὁ φιλοπονώτατος πόλεμος, 47) is reduced, and he needs to create a space for rest.¹¹¹ Requesting advice on how to achieve this, he receives opposing responses from the Median Artabazus and the Persian Chrysantas.

While Artabazus jealously clings to the idea that he deserves privileged access to Cyrus (54), the Persian Chrysantas offers a more elegantly reasoned solution (55–6). In the past, Cyrus could rely on the support of his friends, but needed to win that of the multitude so that they too would work with him. Now that Cyrus' rule does not depend on mass support, he should be allowed some privacy. 'What pleasure would you derive from ruling, if you alone were deprived of a hearth?' (ἦ τί ἀπολαύσεις ἂν τῆς ἀρχῆς, εἰ μόνος ἄμοιρος εἶης ἐστίας, 56).¹¹² Even further, this unjust distribution in their favour, an instance of *pleonexia* (πλεονεκτεῖν, 56) would be a source of shame to his friends (ἡμᾶς αἰσχύνεσθαι), should they see him labouring outside while they relaxed at home.

Cyrus accepts Chrysantas' argument from friendship but adopts the full regalia of a Median king. Gera and previous editors are puzzled by this, but Cyrus must project his status as a spectacle for those who cannot experience his virtuous character directly, and the trappings of kingship enable this performance.¹¹³ His separation is enforced by two sets of bodyguards, first eunuchs (59), emphasising the orientalising aspects of the narrative, and then the 10,000, carefully selected from Persia, where they had led lives of poverty, leading to a strong work ethic and resourcefulness (67). Cyrus' two levels of protection thus embody the extremes of the different cultures of his empire.

Cyrus' post-victory address to his peers (ὁμοτίμους) and influential friends (71) outlines the political philosophy through which he intends to maintain his empire (7.5.72–85). They should not change their habits from hard work and self-control in their new situation, lest their skills, bodies and virtues deteriorate; he correctly identifies the new challenge of the maintenance of power (76). Chrysantas' image of leisure as a peace dividend is erroneous. Cyrus recommends the continuing practice of virtue; only by being better than the ruled will they demonstrate that they deserve power (78).¹¹⁴ And only goods achieved through toil lead to *eudaimonia*, showing the true position of Croesus and other defeated leaders now deprived of weaponry and opportunity (79).

Xenophon restates much of this in his analysis of Cyrus' rule (8.1.17–47). Cyrus expects that he and his peers will observe each other as before, but the seclusion of kingship and the visibility of Cyrus mostly through spectacular performances (such as the king's parades described in 8.3.13) may make this difficult. Cyrus intends that many should come to court, and witness the spectacle laid on there, where he appears 'adorned with virtue' (κεκοσμημένον τῇ ἀρετῇ, 8.1.21). This emphasises the object of his transformation, to render his inner virtue, accessible to friends such as Pantheia, perceptible to his subjects through performance.

He incentivises court attendance for those with the leisure (defined as the ability to live off the labour of others, 8.1.16) to attend, creating a hierarchy within his subjects of those who may benefit from his rule by imitation of his example, and those who benefit by witnessing his kingly spectacles. Thus both the Persian and

Median examples are incorporated into Cyrus' new two-tier system of government, within which the court is a polis and the world outside an empire.¹¹⁵ Even the palace kitchens exemplify the sophisticated polis, through their division of labour into highly specialised skills equivalent to parts rather than the whole of the art of shoemaking (8.2.4–6).¹¹⁶

Xenophon emphasises that Cyrus himself is the model for the political ethos he wishes to encourage (8.1.12, 27, 30, 33, 37). But this model is directed to his courtiers, the leisure classes, not the wider subjects, many of whom, as Xenophon noted at the beginning, never see Cyrus in person but are still willing to obey him (1.1.5). At first Xenophon ascribed this to fear, but now he argues that Cyrus' control is due to beneficence (self-interested, in Azoulay's account) rather than the product of fear (8.2.8–9).¹¹⁷ But there is a great degree of separation between Cyrus and the subjects who may never see him; his rule over them depends not on direct mimesis of his virtue, but the *thauma* of spectacle. Whereas his personal charisma won him the support of Artabazus and others, his distant subjects have to create this charisma within their imagined version of him. Their imitation of Cyrus will be like the imitation of the divine king in the *Statesman*, prone to error and degradation in the shape of worse constitutions.

Cyrus' ability to see his subjects emphasises the nature of his rule. Unlike Deioces, with his networks of informers (Hdt. 1.100.2), Cyrus relies on those bound to him by ties of *charis* to provide him with the information he needs; his beneficiaries become his eyes and ears (8.2.10–12), resulting in his omnipresence as an embodied 'seeing law' (βλέποντα νόμον, 8.1.22). The absence of law would turn Cyrus' rule into tyranny; instead, he embodies it. Legal processes clearly continue at least in the Persian part of the empire, with courts and judges (8.2.27), but the thought of Cyrus' knowledge of their actions is the greatest motivation for obedience among his subjects. The image of Cyrus becomes the form of justice; but this does not depend on the virtue monarchy model that operates within the court, but on constructions of monarchical power that depend on *thauma* and spectacle. Xenophon's Cyrus thus combines elements of Herodotean kingship and the virtue model of kingship that Isocrates and Xenophon develop.

Conclusion

Isocrates and Xenophon both develop a new form of justification for single rule, in which the claim to authority rests on the virtue of the monarch. This requires an accepted understanding of virtue, or concept of the domain in which virtue might be a useful criterion for distinguishing a sole ruler from subjects, both of which are contested. Isocrates avoids some difficult questions about the possibility of monarchy within an Athenian context by using less contentious, marginal examples; his Cyprian monarchs are allied to Athens, but from a small and relatively distant polis which makes no claim to authority over Athens itself. Thus Isocrates can safely explore his virtue monarchy theory separately from questions of its applicability to Athens, which he would not support.¹¹⁸ Isocrates further complicates his commitment to the virtue model by providing evidence that Evagoras

in particular counts as a king through the traditional claims of genealogy and connection to the divine.

Within a polis, the king must be commensurable with citizens, as Xenophon's Cambyses is with the Persian *homotimoi*. For weaker kings within a smaller polis-scale society, commensurability and access through which they can act as a paradigm of virtue can be achieved, as is exemplified by Isocrates' Evagoras and Nicocles. Xenophon's Cyrus, however, must deliver the extreme form of monarchy to project his authority to far-flung subjects. The virtue monarchy he sets up within his court at Babylon may authorise and support this, but the consequences of his transformation into an image and ideal complicate his ability to be commensurable within the court, requiring an elaborate system of access and the creation of an artificial, performative persona to project this model beyond the court and 'bewitch' (καταγοητεύειν, 8.1.40) his subjects into obedience. The non-symmetrical generosity of kings also marks their separation from the reciprocal processes of the polis.

Whether such difference between ruler and ruled could be supported by historical examples was problematic, and it is possible to read some of Plato's explorations of divine kingship in golden ages separate from the historical and present epoch as a riposte to virtue monarchy models in which a human individual provides the paradeigma for imitation. The difficulties of the extreme form of monarchy represented by Cyrus are further explored and criticised by Plato in the *Laws* and Aristotle in the *Politics*, but nonetheless this model persisted into the Hellenistic world.

Notes

- 1 Haubold 2015.
- 2 The classic survey of this topic remains Harvey 1965, 1966.
- 3 Surveying ancient virtue ethics, Rachana Kamtekar draws a distinction between these approaches, but does not position Xenophon or Isocrates within her model (Kamtekar 2013). However, the tension between short-term consequentialism and longer-term ethical goals is evident in Xenophon's work, especially the *Cyropaedia*.
- 4 Strathern 2019: 164–6.
- 5 Weber's concept of charisma (originally from his *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 1922, and *Politik als Beruf*, 1919) has been invoked in describing the attributes of virtue kings (Azoulay 2004: 28; Geertz 1983: 122–3; Weber 1994: 311–13, 2013: 1111–57).
- 6 See Alexiou 2007, 2010: 14–15 on Isocrates' 'agreed goods' and 'common-sense' virtue.
- 7 Isocrates' and Xenophon's works as precursors of later kingship treatises: Haake 2013: 170–3; Sidebottom 2006: 120–4, and especially Oswyn Murray's DPhil thesis (Murray 1971); cf. Hahn 2000; Walbank 1984: 75–6. The centrality of ruling to Isocrates' and Xenophon's political thought: Gray 2000: 146–51.
- 8 Eder 1995: 155; Hadot 1972: 574–6. Eder in turn over-emphasises the differences between Plato, Isocrates and Xenophon in analysing kingship, and plays down the ethical and philosophical commitments of the latter pair.
- 9 Eder 1995: 155, 166–70.
- 10 The use of the biographical and narrative form across several of the works discussed is significant, in that it is named individuals who are the topic of enquiry. See Hägg 2012: 30–66 for readings of the *Evagoras*, *Agesilaus* and *Cyropaedia* as biographies.

- 11 Sinclair 1951: 135–7.
- 12 Stroheker (1954) follows Maass (1887: 581–94) in seeing the *Nicocles* as central to Isocrates' political thought. Both Mathieu (1925) and Cloché (1963) largely ignore the Cyprian works, focusing on Isocrates' Athenian political context; Bringmann 1965 briefly mentions Isocrates' thought on monarchy (103–8), while Bloom (1955: 47–59), gives it more consideration. Eucken (1983: 213–69) draws on Kehl (1962: 46–51), treating the *Cyprians* in detail; elsewhere, their rhetorical and educational context has had more attention (Jaeger 1939: 84–105; Poulakos 1997: 26–45) than their political content.
- 13 The *Ad Nicoclem* is more difficult to assess, as the relevant section (14–39) appears to be highly interpolated, unless the shorter version presented in the *Antidosis* (73) is Isocrates' own abridgement: Drerup 1906: cxliv–v.
- 14 Keyt suggests that the force of Aristotle's use of *phainesthai* and *dokein* in *Politics* 5.11 implies that the tyrant should pretend to possess these qualities, and that this distinguishes his use of the idea of virtue monarchy from that of Isocrates (Keyt 1999: 174–6).
- 15 The audience may be Isocrates' Athenian and non-Athenian students as well as Nicocles' Salaminian subjects (Eder 1995; Poulakos 1997: 27); Athenian educators' role in educating non-Athenian leaders, seen as potential tyrants, was a theme of debate between different schools.
- 16 See Chapter 3.
- 17 Too 1995: 190–1.
- 18 Poulakos 1997: 26–7; Isocrates' general reticence to applying his monarchical thought to contemporary Athens should be considered here.
- 19 Jaeger 1939: 88–91; Poulakos 1997: 9–25.
- 20 Eucken 1983: 250–1, 54–5; Poulakos 1997: 18–20. Christian Bouchet, exploring Isocrates' thought on hegemony, points to Isocrates' reference to Gorgias' description of *logos* as *hegemōn* (Gorgias *Helen* 4, Isocrates *Nicocles* 9, Bouchet 2014: 31 n.6).
- 21 Haskins 2004: 88–9.
- 22 Nicolai 2004: 143–4 notes that Isocrates' insertion of himself into Nicocles' speech complicates our ability to interpret the work, and assess the *politeia* of Salamis, which may be Isocrates' invention.
- 23 The shift to the optative, and the reference to 'tyrannies' (τυραννίδας) with its negative connotations, suggests that Isocrates recognises that this is a provocative suggestion.
- 24 *Leviathan* Ch. 19 (Hobbes 1996: 129–30).
- 25 E.g. at Xen. *Cyr.* 2.3.2–16; Pl. *Leg.* 6.757b5–d1.
- 26 Arist. *NE* 5.3; *Pol.* 3.9.1280a25–31, 3.12.
- 27 See Chapter 3.
- 28 Mildness (*praotēs*) as a quality of monarchy and monarchs: *Nic.* 31, *Ad Nic.* 23, *Helen* 37. Sandridge 2012: 66–9.
- 29 Cf. Plato's image of the democratic beast (Pl. *Rep.* 6.493ad), which shifts unpredictably between the 'most difficult' and 'mildest' moods (χαλεπώτατον, ἢ πραότατον, 493b2).
- 30 See Isoc. *Ep.* 1.5–7 on the ease of addressing individuals rather than multitudes: see Chapter 7 on Aristotle.
- 31 Demosthenes later notes Philip's freedom as 'one man who is sovereign and master' (ἐν ὄντα κύριον . . . καὶ δεσπότην, Dem. 1.4); Athenian dilatoriness results in fragmented power and consequent ineffectiveness (2.29–30) (Mader 2006: 380–1).
- 32 Sanders 1987: 5, 33 n.16.
- 33 Perhaps analogous to the suspension of internal political conflict during wartime through the use of governments of national unity in modern democracies; for the command of kings as a Spartan political practice, see Cartledge 1987: 105, 2002a: 61–2.
- 34 Cf. Gray 2011a on Thucydides' use of the construction.

- 35 Luraghi 2013a: 19–20. Implicit throughout the speech is the suggestion that Nicocles' subjects fail to respect his authority; whether this marks the kind of irony that some scholars see in Xenophon's account of Cyrus' is unclear.
- 36 Gotteland 2001: 302–3.
- 37 Alexiou 2007.
- 38 Maass (1887: 586–8) compares this passage with Hdt. 3.81, Megabyzus' speech against democracy and tyranny; Eder 1995: 169 notes that Isocrates delivers similar lists in the *Evagoras* (42) and *Ad Nicoclem* (24).
- 39 An ironic reading of Isocrates' account might attribute Nicocles' lack of *pleonexia* to his weakness.
- 40 Xen. *Hiero* 1.26–30. Tyranny and sexual impropriety in various forms are frequently connected, as at Ar. *Pol.* 5.11.1314b23–5, 1315a14–16; the story of Gyges in both Herodotus' (Hdt. 1.7–13) and Plato's (*Rep.* 2.359c7–360c5) versions, the story of Periander in Socles' speech (Hdt. 5.92g), and that of Pisistratus's marriage (1.61), make the link clear (Dewald 2003: 30–2).
- 41 Cohen 1991: 174 on legal implications in Athens. Aristotle identifies Archelaus of Macedon and Cotys as monarchs attacked because of their sexual improprieties, at *Pol.* 5.10.1311b6–23.
- 42 Mathieu (1928–62: 130) regards this as 'assez exceptionnelle vu les mœurs du temps' (cf. *Ad Nic.* 11, 31).
- 43 See also *To Nicocles*, 31.
- 44 That these virtues are those of the *kaloikagathoi* perhaps supports Eder's view that this is an appeal to aristocratic perspectives valued by some Athenians (Eder 1995: 162, 66).
- 45 Contra Poulakos 1997: 26–7.
- 46 Isocrates does not theorise *mimesis* as a political concept, or use the abstract noun, preferring verbal forms; he extends an analogy from education in which the student learns by copying the teacher, without necessarily reaching the same standard (see Too 1995: 184–94).
- 47 Although a similar effect could be achieved through the collapse of public–private distinction in tyrannies, the benefit there accrues to the tyrant alone.
- 48 This closes a thought introduced at 32; the increase has now become conditional on action by both ruler and ruled.
- 49 See Chapter 3. The *Panegyricus* (c. 380) pre-dates the *Evagoras* (probably written around 370–365 BCE).
- 50 Alexiou 2010: 30; Classen 2010: 55. However, C. Körner argues that the Cyprian monarchy should be seen as kingship rather than tyranny based on the long-standing use of kingship language in Salaminian sources (Körner 2017: 231–40).
- 51 Alexiou 2009, 2010.
- 52 Collins 2015: 202.
- 53 Accounts of the *Evagoras* as biography include Hägg 2012: 30–41; Halliwell 1990; Momigliano 1993: 49–50; as rhetoric, Poulakos 1987.
- 54 For comparisons of the two works and their rhetoric see Noël 2014 and Pontier 2018.
- 55 See Chapter 4. Isocrates is also, as Tomas Hägg pointed out, ignoring the established tradition of prose literature describing the life and ideas of Socrates (Hägg 2012: 31–2).
- 56 Gotteland 2001: 304–5; Halliwell 1990: 46–7.
- 57 Alexiou 2010: 101.
- 58 Stephen Halliwell argues that the presentation of Evagoras' character virtues illustrates *eugeneia* rather than offering an alternative to it (Halliwell 1990: 51–2).
- 59 Although Evagoras' pragmatic decision to stay above the political fray also suggests an under-current of *realpolitik* in Isocrates' thought, like that often attributed to Xenophon.
- 60 Arist. *Pol.* 5.10.1312a9–14, in which the general Cyrus kills the luxury-loving Median king Astyages; Herodotus acknowledges many accounts of Cyrus (Hdt. 1.95, Mathieu and Brémond 1928–62: 155 n.1). Cf. *Philip* 66.

- 61 Mueller-Goldingen suggests that this use of Cyrus derives from Antisthenes (Mueller-Goldingen 1995: 32–44). There are also different versions of Evagoras' story; Isocrates here omits his death, which Aristotle reports as an assassination by a eunuch as a result of court intrigue, a story which does little to establish Evagoras as a model of Greek leadership virtues (Arist. *Pol.* 5.10.1311b4–6; Diodorus Siculus 15.47.8, cf. *Nicocles* 31).
- 62 The Athenians identified Evagoras as *basileus* when awarding him a statue in the *agora*, in a 394 BCE decree (*IG* II² 20: *basileus* lines 6, 16, cf. *Evagoras* 57); see Lewis and Stroud 1979; Rhodes and Osborne 2003: 50–5.
- 63 This is a somewhat contrarian position for Isocrates to take, opposing the conventional, Athenian democratic view that democratic procedures and scrutiny prevented tyrannical action by office-holders, and also overlooks the reasons why a series of Athenian *kaloikagathoi* might wish to relocate to Evagoras' city.
- 64 Cf. the stress on legitimate offspring and the transmission of divine ancestry, *Nicocles* 42, and the possibility of transition from tyranny to kingship in the pseudo-Platonic *Eighth Letter*.
- 65 Bringmann 1965: 111; Eucken 1983: 264–5; Kehl 1962; Merlan 1954.
- 66 Xenophon's obituary of Cyrus the Younger, stressing his taste for summary punishment (*Anabasis* 1.9.13) and generosity (21–2), offers a more despotic model of monarchy, cf. Luccioni 1948: 48–51. Cyrus the Younger's virtue is, however, emphasised in the *Oeconomicus* (*Oec.* 4.18–25).
- 67 Major treatments of the *Cyropaedia* from literary and historical perspectives: Due 1989; Gera 1993; Stadter 1991; Mueller-Goldingen 1995; Tuplin 1996; from (Straussian) political theory perspectives: Tatum 1989; Nadon 2001. Sandridge 2012 focuses on the ethics of leadership, while Gray 2011b, using a literary reading to oppose Straussian readings, underplays the complexity and sophistication of Xenophon's analysis of Cyrus' kingship. On Xenophon's position in the history of orientalism see Dabashi 2015: 36–8.
- 68 For a comparison of the *kairos* in the *Cyropaedia* and *Statesman*, see Attack 2018b.
- 69 The general problem of dating the composition of Xenophon's works includes the *Cyropaedia*, but Plato (*Laws* III) is almost certainly later, written in response to Xenophon's work (Danzig 2003b; Dorion 2003). Possible composition dates for the *Cyropaedia* are discussed by Mueller-Goldingen (1995), and Bizon (1971: xlvi–xlvii), and references in the closing section suggest that it at least dates from the 360s.
- 70 See the *Anabasis*, and especially the portrait of Cyrus the Younger (*Ana.* 1.9.1–30).
- 71 Stadter 1991; Tuplin 2013 both explore the fictive elements in the construction of the *Cyropaedia* and their consequences.
- 72 Machiavelli 1988: 53–4. Nadon 1996; Newell 1983; Rasmussen 2009, all drawing on Straussian readings of Xenophon originating in Strauss 1939 and expanded in his account of Xenophon's *Hiero* (Strauss 2013).
- 73 Within the *Cyropaedia*, Socrates seems to be a model for Tigranes' teacher and fellow-hunter (3.1.14), as if Tigranes were an interlocutor in the *Republic*'s hunt for justice (*Pl. Rep.* 4.432b8–c2, cf. 5.451d4–9, 466c5–d3 on the community of guards as fellow-hunters); Gera argues that the tone of this debate is non-Socratic (Gera 1993: 97–8).
- 74 Breebaart 1983; Carlier 1978: 138–9, followed by Danzig 2012.
- 75 Nadon 1996: 161–80; Tatum 1989; see also Gray 2011b: 264–5. One extreme view is provided by Reisert 2009, who describes Cyrus as a 'moral black hole', while Thomas Hägg points out that this is not a biography in which the author is attempting to create a consistent psychological portrait of Cyrus' character (Hägg 2012: 60–1).
- 76 Tamiolaki 2012: 568–70 suggests that Xenophon uses subsidiary characters to establish the virtue of his main characters.
- 77 Nadon 2001: 161–2.
- 78 Mueller-Goldingen 1995: 64–87; Nadon 2001: 29–42; Tuplin 1994, 2013: 75.

- 79 Xenophon does not criticise Persia, as Plato does Sparta, for excessive devotion to honour (*Republic*) or militarism (*Laws*) (Carlier 1978: 143). Tuplin 1994 argues that Xenophon's Persia is not based on the historical Sparta. For an assessment of the historical Cyrus' self-presentation see Kuhrt 2007b.
- 80 Xenophon's limited use of ethnographic detail, for exemplification rather than description, differentiates his exploration of empire from that of Herodotus.
- 81 Tuplin 2013: 75–6.
- 82 Newell 1983: 894; see also Danzig 2012: 499–500; Gray 2011b: 232–43; Pangle 1994. However, Cyrus does not overthrow the Persian republic, and develops a much more nuanced relationship with it than Newell's binary analysis suggests.
- 83 Nadon 2001: 43.
- 84 The ethnonym used as personal name may be an indicator of slave status.
- 85 Danzig 2009; Gera 1993: 73–8; Too 1988: 289–90.
- 86 Gera 1993: 50–72; Sandridge 2012: 71.
- 87 Due 1989: 92–3; Gera 1993: 54–5.
- 88 As Hägg helpfully notes, deception is a military tactic, not a moral characteristic of individual psychology, for Xenophon here (2012: 60).
- 89 Gera 1993: 65–6 notes the craft analogy and links this discussion to the *Memorabilia*.
- 90 Cyrus is always the object of desire. His Median admirer Artabazus represents this throughout the work, stealing a kiss (1.4.27–8), joining Cyrus in pursuit of the Assyrians (4.1.22–3), rebuking Araspas for his desire (6.1.34–5), claiming Cyrus' attention (7.5.48–54), and finally demonstrating his worth by winning a horse race (8.3.25).
- 91 This episode, and the question of whether Cyrus has deliberately deceived his uncle, are central to representations of Cyrus' rule as (Nadon 2001: 88–108; Newell 1983; Tatum 1989). Gray 2011b: 232–43 shows that the narrative is patterned.
- 92 Danzig 2012: 518–19.
- 93 Danzig 2012; Gera 1993: 98–109.
- 94 Gray 2011b: 275–6.
- 95 Cf. Pl. *Plt.* 273e.
- 96 Nadon 2001: 46 n.56 suggests that Croesus recognises that Cyrus is performing an *imitatio dei* in his transformation to kingship. Sandridge 2012: 56 suggests that Xenophon's Cyrus learns from Herodotus', while Gray 2011b: 150–1 emphasises the Socratic aspects of the exchange.
- 97 Whereas Herodotus' Croesus addresses Cyrus as 'king' (βασιλεῦ, 1.87.3).
- 98 Ellis 2016; Gray 2011b: 150–1.
- 99 Cf. Hdt. 1.30.3.
- 100 Lefèvre 1971: 290–2.
- 101 The palace guard who came to power after seeing Candaules' wife, Hdt. 1.8–13.
- 102 Azoulay 2004: 65 discusses *charis* and the feminisation of its recipients.
- 103 Treatments of the Abradatas and Pantheia story: Azoulay 2007: 284–6; Cartledge 1993: 11–13; Due 1989: 79–83; Gera 1993: 221–45; Gray 2011b: 136–41; Nadon 2001: 152–60; Tatum 1989: 163–88.
- 104 The friendship is not purely one of utility (Azoulay 2004: 282–90).
- 105 For more on the tension between friendship and utility, see Melina Tamiolaki on *Mem.* 2.6 (Tamiolaki 2014).
- 106 Recognition of this section's important political analysis: Breebaart 1983; Carlier 1978: 138–43; Gera 1993: 285–99; Luccioni 1948: 236–8. Strauss' 'ironic' readings (Nadon 2001: 147–60; Newell 1983) miss the complexity and subtlety of Xenophon's analysis.
- 107 Luccioni 1948: 239–40. See Chapter 1.
- 108 Gera 1993: 285–6.
- 109 The exemplification and practice of virtue may be limited to the court environment where Cyrus is visible.

110 Azoulay 2004: 318–24.

111 Although Agesilaus' being *philoponos* is a positive quality, *Ag.* 9.3.

112 The text is corrupt at this point, but the emphasis on Cyrus' 'unique position' (μόνον, μόνος, 56) is clear.

113 Gera 1993: 291–3; Xenophon's description of Cyrus choosing to perform the role of king is reminiscent of Judith Butler's concept of the performance of gender (Butler 1990: 24–5), not least because of the role of clothing and cosmetics in the creation of both performances, and also the situationist concept of ideological spectacle (Debord 1994). I explore this in more detail in Attack 2018a.

114 This is reiterated at 83, and hinted in the closing section on being a good example to your sons (86).

115 Xenophon does not portray Cyrus' rule as a mixed constitution, but it does mix forms of kingship, or less charitably it is kingship within the court and tyranny outside.

116 This contrasts with Xenophon's usual praise of plain food and simple lifestyle, e.g. the contrast between Agesilaus and Persian leaders (*Agesilaus* 9.1–3), cf. *Hdt.* 9.82.

117 Azoulay 2004: 323.

118 Sinclair 1951: 120.

6 Kingship in Plato's later political thought

While Xenophon's characters saw the good king as a good shepherd, Plato's characters tease out the ontological consequences of the shepherd-king analogy, denying that rule by such a figure can create a political community (*Plt.* 271e7–8). Plato's later political dialogues address this newer context directly, clarifying his concept of kingship, critiquing his rivals' models and engaging with problems that are minimised or set to one side in the highly specific project of the *Republic*. It is unclear how much these writers respond directly to each other's written and circulated texts, beyond a few explicit references, but the common themes, imagery and examples suggest that all are participating in a dialogue in which the discourse of kingship is an important element.

The *Statesman* both progresses the identification of *basilikē technē* and challenges Xenophon's and Isocrates' positive accounts of monarchy, never quite confirming the possibility of kingship in ascribing achievable political agency to a *politikos* rather than a *basileus*. Kingship is more a metaphysical than a political concept for Plato, and the greater his focus on the working of the polis, the less we see of characters labelled as kings. Where he does focus on kingship, there is often a strong cosmological element in play; kings replicate cosmic order and connect cosmos and polis, and the kings of his later political thought, positioned in a mythical past, often depend on divine status to do so.¹ Kings also become the centre of mythical tableaux and occasionally narrative, often told with a distinctive 'mythical voice'.²

Plato rejects the idealisation of both founder kings and recent historical kings; recent examples are deficient as exemplars, while distant examples are unknowable. He suggests that the good kings needed in the virtue model could exist only in an epoch separated from ours by an impassable rupture, represented in the *Statesman*, the first of three attempts to explore this model, by a complete reversal of the cosmos that changes the experience of time and reality and destroys the possibility of continuous knowledge.³ Both the *Timaeus/Critias* and the *Laws* modify this account, localising the destruction and relocating the golden age of good kingship into the same cosmic era as ours, but still in a time frame which renders the distant past inaccessible to present human memory.⁴ Plato attacks both the Athenian myth and history used by Xenophon and Isocrates, and the figure of the shepherd king which was receiving renewed attention in Xenophon's

work in particular.⁵ His demarcation of these stories as temporally isolated from the present acts as a critique of the conflation of myth and history in his contemporaries' political thought.⁶ Neither oral accounts nor historical investigation can cross the temporal ruptures Plato generates, and the ideal kingship promoted by Isocrates and Xenophon is repositioned on the other side of these barriers of temporality. The distant human past cannot be known in a manner that enables it to provide exempla for imitation even if that were a practice that might result in the transmission of virtue, as it does for Isocrates and Xenophon. For Plato the human virtue king is an epistemic impossibility; the shepherd-king image reveals that kingship as conceptualised by other thinkers cannot be separated from its cosmic context.

When Plato depicts kings in his alternative time frames they are gods and *daimones*, not humans. While their divinity and persistence might make them suitable for imitation in a stable temporality, the temporal rupture makes it hard to know about them in the present sufficiently well to be able to imitate them, even if that were thought to be achievable.⁷ While some readings of the *Statesman* in particular seek to diminish the distinction between the ages of Zeus and Cronus, and to make them parallels rather than opposites, such attempts to rescue the Age of Zeus confound Plato's argumentative structure, which reappears in the *Laws*.

The narrative structures and literary emplotment of Plato's versions of stories of past golden-age kings are significant.⁸ Plato switches into a narrative mode more suggestive of myth than history, inventing some material and adapting some from earlier traditions. He surrounds these myths with methodological discussions about the kind of account given and arguments used; such discussion is thematic in the *Statesman* but also evident in the *Timaeus/Critias* and the *Laws*.⁹ As a result, the material available for evaluating Plato's later thoughts on monarchy is conceptually rich.

Kingship and time in the *Statesman*

The stated goal of the *Statesman* is to identify the *politikos* (*Plt.* 258b2–3), the skilled politician, after the identification of the sophist in its partner dialogue, a conversation set on the previous day. In his second long conversation, the Eleatic Stranger engages Young Socrates, a student nominated by Socrates to take on the role of interlocutor, in their search, the *politikos* will turn out to have some kingly characteristics without being a king, a status and identity elusive in the present-day world.

The investigation begins by identifying political and kingly skills and practitioners (259d4–5), looking back to previous difficulties in identifying the craft of kingship, and its relationship with the productive crafts. It will suggest further refinements that position what had been identified as a craft as an *epistēmē* (clarifying that it is not a productive craft), and also separate a new category of ruler, the 'true king' (ἀληθινοῦ βασιλέως, 259b1), more clearly from other possible forms of ruling. This topic is announced at the outset, when the Eleatic Stranger suggests that the kingly, political, despotic and even estate-manager's crafts should

be assessed together (258e8–11), and asks whether they share a single *epistēmē* (259c1–4).¹⁰

This marks a change of emphasis from the Socratic inquiry which led to *aporia* in the *Euthydemus*; the Eleatic Stranger does not share Socrates' assumptions in that dialogue, such as the view from the first protreptic that wisdom is the only good imparted by knowledge. Here the *politikos* is shown to hold a specific intellectual skill, which the later part of the dialogue shows to have practical application. The possessors of such knowledge are identified as 'the knower' (τὸν ἐπιστήμονα, 301b1) or as 'skilled' (ἐντεχνον, 300e1) and those without it as 'non-knowers' (ἀνεπιστήμονες, 300d9).¹¹

Implicit in the *Statesman's* opening sections, both the division and the myth, is an attack on the model of kingship valorised by Plato's Socratic rivals, particularly Xenophon, in their use of the shepherd-king analogy.¹² Plato had himself previously used the analogy between ruler and shepherd in *Republic* I, where shepherding is folded into the craft analogy to demonstrate the distinction between Socrates' and Thrasymachus' value systems.¹³ For Thrasymachus, shepherds are tyrants who manage their flocks for their personal benefit, rather than that of the animals in their care (*Rep.* 1.343b1–c); Socrates uses his principle of specialisation (345b8–d5, 346a6–8) to argue against this by separating the realisation of end-products of craft from incidental benefits of performing the craft itself (346c2–d8). For him, the benefit a good ruler might expect is not conventional, especially financial, reward (347b6–e4), such as tyrants might seek. The only compensation for ruling, within this craft structure, is relief from the fear of being ruled by someone less good than you (347c3–5). Socrates' philosopher kings will, through their education, perceive and respond to their obligation to rule (*Rep.* 7.519d4–520a4), but it will be an austere form of rule, stripped of the conventional attributes of kingship, whether the personal benefits of tyranny noted by Thrasymachus or the more cosmic and religious accretions of traditional kingship.¹⁴ In the *Republic*, the structural position and role of kingship are significant, with the king acting as an agent of metaphysical change. In the *Statesman*, the role of the *politikos* will ultimately be depicted in a more conventional setting, but not before fantastic alternatives have been explored.

The outcome of the first section of the dialogue is a definition of the *politikos* as a herdsman (*Plt.* 267a8–c3), generated using the method of collection and division (itself somewhat problematic).¹⁵ At both the opening and close of the division the Eleatic Stranger has asserted the identity of the *basilikos* and the *politikos*; they are 'the same' (τὰντόν, 259d4–5, 267c2–3). This protracted division is a transparent manoeuvre to introduce the imagery of the shepherd king, which was resurgent in fourth-century political discourse. Plato appears to respond to Xenophon's use of the image, itself probably a response to Thrasymachus' assertion of the self-interest of the shepherd in the *Republic*.¹⁶ Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* features evocations of the shepherd king in its opening section and close to the end (1.1.2, 8.2.14); in the latter example, Cyrus is quoted as likening 'the deeds of the good king' to those of a 'good shepherd', asserting that their similarity lies in working for the *eudaimonia* of citizens and flocks respectively.¹⁷ In turn, Plato's Eleatic Stranger insists, against

young Socrates' protests (262a3–4), on ignoring the distinction between ruling animals and ruling humans (262a9–263a1) as a shortcut within the division. The question of where the division between man, beast and god lies, and which is more significant, opens up questions of political ontology, both in identifying kinds and establishing the relationship between them.¹⁸ The problem of rule between kinds and within kinds becomes a central problem for the dialogue, and remains central to the discourse of kingship. The protracted division of the *Statesman's* opening section operates as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the shepherd-king analogy.

After the division's failure to produce a satisfactory definition (268d5–e6), the Eleatic Stranger introduces a myth, to demonstrate why the divine shepherd model is unhelpful for the project of identifying or defining the possessor of kingly or political knowledge. This myth is presented as 'a demonstration (*apodeixis*) of the king' (269c1–2, 273e5–6), using the term with which Herodotus identifies the result of his inquiry (Hdt. 1.proem); Plato thus presents it as an alternative to a historical account.¹⁹ In Plato's model, the shepherd image applies only to a divine ruler, or at least to a ruler ontologically distinct from the ruled, as shepherds are from sheep.²⁰ This is the fundamental problem of accounting for kingship in the context of the polis with its ideology of citizen equality, even for models of the oligarchic polis where that equality is highly restricted; Xenophon might praise Cyrus as a model leader, but the analogy between Cyrus and the leader of a Greek polis (or a general subject to democratic scrutiny) is somewhat fuzzy. Because Xenophon claims that Cyrus 'differed from other kings' (διήνεγκε τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων, *Cyr.* 1.1.4), and depicts him undergoing change on his assumption of kingship (7.5.37) he may recognise the distinction that Plato's characters present as a metaphysical/ontological one.²¹

Cosmology and politics

The use of the myth as a device to resolve difficulties in defining the statesman is itself subject to critique within the dialogue, with the Eleatic Stranger admitting that the myth has somehow gone too far and exceeded what was needed (277b6–c3). It is also not clear that all forms of kingship are ruled out by the separation of the ages; the possibility of good kingship in the present age is suggested towards the end of the dialogue, although left as an improbable outcome.²² What is more firmly suggested is that the criteria for human kingship, that is, the rule of a king who shares our humanity, reside in the possession of the knowledge that equates to *basilikē technē*, which Plato expects only to be something imitated not possessed in the ordinary run of things, rather than in the imitation of human exemplars who are already faulty instances of the *basilikos* or *politikos*. The existing typology of constitutions is repurposed to reflect the ability of different types of rulers to imitate the ideal (300e11–301a6).

The myth outlines a cosmology that makes the transmission of any historical account of this example of excellence in rule, because of the impossibility of historical knowledge of the Age of Cronus. It also suggests that, if there were to be such a king, both the cosmos and human experience would have to be impossibly

different from their forms in the Age of Zeus, the current age. The most significant distinction is the role of the presiding god, who in the Age of Cronus steers the cosmos, but in the Age of Zeus lets go and observes without direct intervention. The divine shepherds of the Age of Cronus are, like their herds, ultimately controlled by this presiding god. Such a scenario can be accessed through mythical narrative, although how the Eleatic Stranger or others telling such narratives come to know them remains unexplored.

Plato uses language to mark the distinctive temporality of myth and its separate status from the historical past as a source of knowledge. The perfect tense, which in Greek has a sense of continuation into the present, describes the acquisition of knowledge of the myth through hearing and speech (ἀκήκοας, 268e10; ἀκηκόαμεν, 269a8; εἶρηται, 269b8; εἶρηκεν, 269c1), suggesting that it has effected a lasting transformation in the listener.²³ The use of the perfect tense suggests that stability and persistence characterise this form of knowledge, and establishes the timelessness of the Age of Cronus.

In the Age of Cronus the divine ruler controls many processes, described as having his hand on the tiller (272e3–4, cf. 269c4–5), while in the Age of Zeus, which is similar to or the same as the world in which we live, and in which the divine presence has withdrawn from direct control of the cosmos and simply observes it (272e4–6).²⁴ The myth describes life in the Age of Cronus, and the turmoil that occurs during the transition between the two ages, which occurs after a set period of time; there appears to be an assumption that the listener can already account for their experiences in the Age of Zeus (272b1–3), the present in the dialogue's narrative time.

That these opposed temporalities represent a twofold structure has been much disputed, but the threefold and more complex models identified by Brisson, Rowe, Carone and others obscure the important binary opposition that Plato makes between the two temporal spaces of human historical time and a divine era in which the world is 'immortal and ageless' (ἀθάνατον . . . καὶ ἀγήρων, 273e4), like the gods.²⁵ Another key distinction is that in the Age of Cronus there is direct divine control of all processes, whereas in the Age of Zeus there is not; in the Age of Zeus, elements within the uncontrolled cosmos attempt to imitate the structures of the Age of Cronus as far as they can remember them (273c4–d4), while the divine force watches but does not intervene. The exuberant creative details of the myth hinder analysis of its structure and argumentative purpose, although Ruby Blondell has suggested a thematic opposition between the 'fleece' of the pastoral myth and the 'fabric' woven by the *politikos* in the *polis*, again emphasising a two-stage process which also corresponds to anthropological oppositions of nature and culture.²⁶

As Charles Kahn has shown, adopting the two-stage reading reveals the links between Plato's myth and the cosmology of Presocratic philosopher Empedocles, with the Age of Zeus analogised to Empedocles' era of strife and separation, and the Age of Cronus to that of love.²⁷ The Eleatic Stranger fails to explore how his cycle might complete and return to the Age of Cronus, although such cyclicity is implicit in his model, and when Young Socrates suggests that there will be disruptions at each change (271c3–7) he is praised for doing so with another

perfect verb; 'you have followed along with me' (συμπαρηκολούθηκας, 271c8).²⁸ Providing for the return to the original, good, starting point is often difficult for cyclical models of political change; here it is the god who recognises that a limit has been reached and that order must be restored (273d). Herodotus answers this need with his good kings, such as Deioces and Psammetichus, who bring about the unification half of an Empedoclean cycle and whose activities reset political systems that have reached the end of a cycle.²⁹ Such acts of foundation and unification are the distinctive characteristics of good kings. Plato does not examine this part of the cycle here; arguably the *Republic*, to the limited extent that it sets out the means for establishing Kallipolis, does explore this, as does the *Laws* in suggesting how a lawgiver might bring about a society that best imitates the world of the divine shepherd.

A consequence of the destructive cosmic reversal that the Eleatic Stranger describes (272b6–273a4) is that it separates the two ages and prevents the transmission of information from one to the other. This consequence does not affect the presiding god, or the Eleatic Stranger who, as the narrator, appears to have an omniscient, god's-eye view of the whole process. This further, implicit, distinction in status, between the Eleatic Stranger and those who do not know the myth, may become as important as that between shepherd and flock outside the *Statesman* myth; while the Eleatic Stranger's 'knowledge' of the myth can be accounted for only by its fictionality, it is knowledge that enables him to understand the politics of the human world better in the remainder of the dialogue.

Greeks often assumed that a distinction in kind between ruler and ruled was being made within traditional and non-Greek models of kingship, through formal, public ritual acts such as *proskynesis*.³⁰ The special status of kings in respect of communication with the divine was another aspect of this, and Plato had a particular interest in Egyptian kings. If such attributes of kingship were rejected, new grounds for justifying the claim of the king to rule over others were required. As the Eleatic Stranger notes, rulers in the Age of Zeus have more in common with their subjects, in terms of rearing and education, than rulers in the Age of Cronus (275d9–c4), where the rulers are divine. Plato's solution, in both the *Republic* and the *Statesman*, is to recast the ontological difference between divine king and subjects as the epistemological difference between the philosopher king and subjects.³¹ The *Statesman* completes the process of identifying the kind of knowledge that this model develops, which is explored outside the myth.

One part of the myth, the description of life in the Age of Cronus, resembles a *politeia*, or rather an anti-*politeia*, as it catalogues the absence of those political features and social structures one might find described in a *politeia*, from the society of the Age of Cronus (271e2–272b1). Some features of this section seem targeted at Athenian ideas and imagery; they signal contradictions of the usual descriptions of civic life present in foundation stories from Athens and elsewhere. Here, 'when that [ruler] was the shepherd, there were no *politeiai*' (νέμοντος δὲ ἐκείνου πολιτεῖαι τε οὐκ ἦσαν, 271e7–8); there was 'no possession of wives and children', because of the lack of sexual reproduction (οὐδὲ κτήσεις γυναικῶν καὶ παίδων, 271e8); and no need for agriculture, because 'the ground gave forth

produce of its own accord, not because of farming' (οὐχ ὑπὸ γεωργίας φουμένους, ἀλλ' αὐτομάτης ἀναδιδούσης τῆς γῆς, 272a4–5). Under the care of the divine shepherds, there is neither external nor civil war (271e1–2). A god tends them, in the same way as humans as 'a more divine creature' (ζῷον . . . θειότερον, 271e6) now govern 'lesser species' (γένη φαυλότερα, 271e7). Unlike the *Republic*'s account of the development of the polis, there is no development towards social differentiation and complexity, because there is no apparent change. History is impossible in the age of Age of Cronus, and some of the historical possibilities denied are central to Athenian political myth, such as the foundational significance of agriculture. Plato represents this Athenian claim in his *Menexenus*; in the funeral speech relayed by Socrates, the virtue of the Athenian dead is due to their descent from good men, and ultimately their autochthony and the nurture provided by the land (*Menex.* 237a4–c4, 237e1–2). The speech goes on to praise the Athenian *politeia* (238b7–239a4), or at least an ancestral constitution version of it, in which 'we continue to have kings; at one time through birth, at another time through election' (βασιλῆς μὲν γὰρ αἰεὶ ἡμῖν εἰσιν· οὗτοι δὲ τοτὲ μὲν ἐκ γένους, τοτὲ δὲ αἰρετοί, 238d2–3).³² In Isocrates' version of these claims, Athenians prided themselves on the antiquity of the *politeia* handed down from their ancestors, and on their claim to be the first to introduce agriculture, the gift of Demeter (*Panegyricus* 28). The city's social and political structures, including citizenship, were determined by the family structures of parentage and hereditary tribe.³³

But the Eleatic Stranger's myth excludes the Athenians' skills in agriculture, and the social structures through which their society is constituted, from the Age of Cronus. The humans of this time are truly dependent on their divine shepherds and the natural bounty of the golden age. The skills of Athenian citizens such as Xenophon's Ischomachus are redundant. In Athenian foundation myth, autochthony is a one-off event, whereas in the Stranger's myth it occurs frequently and is repeated many times for each soul (272e1–2).³⁴ The Athenians' proudest claim, that autochthony made their community unique, becomes meaningless as a claim to distinction when all humans are earth-born (272a1).³⁵

The exaggerated separation of the lifestyles of the two ages of the myth generates many difficulties for the humanity of subjects in the Age of Cronus. The description of the autochthonous humans, who emerge grey-haired from the ground (273e) and sink back into it as seeds, is striking, even shocking, and Plato means us to attend to the far-from-incidental details.³⁶ Despite or perhaps because of the natural abundance of resources, the shepherded humans have no motivation for exercising their capacity for reason (272b8–d1). They might not use their leisure for philosophy, but simply gorge themselves instead (272c6–d1). Just how human are these herds, in terms of the criteria used by Greeks?³⁷ They are naked and sleep on the ground (272a5–b1), both characteristics of animals rather than humans engaged in political life. The Eleatic Stranger's model of life in the Age of Cronus negates many features of life in the contemporary polis, and calls into question man's position in established hierarchies of god, man and beast. The age is more strongly differentiated here than in Plato's other Golden Age myths.³⁸

History and the Age of Zeus

The subjects of the Age of Cronus live back-to-front lives, which in turn means that they lack memory.³⁹ With no families to pass stories to, or from which to construct retrospective genealogies, there is no oral basis of history, and no possibility of using methods of developing history dependent on that, such as king lists, to grasp the past. The subjects of Cronus have no knowledge of time, unlike the watching god who is aware of the completion of generations.⁴⁰ It may be hard for them to achieve full rationality, or at least to have any sense of their own historicity; their infantilisation prevents the useful application of any knowledge they might possess. Just like politics, history and genealogy are impossible in the conditions of the Age of Cronus.⁴¹

History can begin only in the Age of Zeus, when human reproduction permits both genealogy and the transmission of memory through human generations in a temporality that is, as the Eleatic Stranger says, like ours (272b1–3).⁴² Plato's account of this history matches the Hesiodic account and also his own general model of decay through generations, exemplified in the decline of constitutions and characters in *Republic* books VIII–IX. God's hand is off the tiller, and entropy begins to operate as a randomising force. The influence of the divine helpers at the start of the Age of Zeus diminishes as the divine element within the human population declines, a process matched in the account of the decline of the kings of Atlantis (*Criti.* 121a8–b7). Athenian *technai* are reasserted; the gifts of seeds and plants are received from other gods (274d2), and humans can develop political skills, taking over the *epimeleia* of their own affairs (274de).⁴³ Only in this age can human beings develop and make use of their capacity for autonomy.

The myth's extravagant cosmological framework suggests that the shepherd-king image is misapplied to human rulers. The opposition between the two ages precludes any human science of rule that worked in the Age of Zeus being applicable in the other (274e10–275a6). The process of imitation is unidirectional; undirected beings in the Age of Zeus struggle to imitate the previous age, while memories of it decay (273b3–d4). But there is a further analogy within the myth, which will play out in the later sections of the dialogue. Just as the god knows when to take his hand off the tiller, the ruler with *politikē technē* knows the right moment, the *kairos*, to act.⁴⁴ Understanding time itself is fundamental to political capability, so humans have the potential for political competence only in the Age of Zeus.

Kingship and craft

The analysis of the myth may have removed the possibility of identifying the *basilikos/politikos* as a herdsman, but this leaves further work to do, first in identifying him as the possessor of knowledge, and then in refining what that knowledge might be and how he might best make use of it. Knowledge of order has been problematised by the myth, and the question of whether it can be reliably imitated in the Age of Zeus remains open; modes of knowledge continue to be

queried, as at 277d1–8, and the ensuing meta-discussion of the need for models to explain the need for models. But in the remainder of the dialogue, Plato depicts the Eleatic Stranger and Young Socrates working their way methodically through the labyrinth that defeated Socrates and Cleinias in the *Euthydemus*, so as to reach a satisfactory definition of the kingly/political art, which will expand the *Republic's* limited account, and clarify the process of imitation by which non-ideal rulers must rule.

This dialogic process participates in the discourse of kingship through its continuing rejection of the methodology of Plato's rivals, and their identification of the basis of kingship. Through this further series of divisions and the use of a new paradigm, Plato tackles the concept of *basilikē technē* in order to eliminate its Xenophontic connotations of a generalisable leadership skill.⁴⁵ The conclusion of this lengthy argument adds a further critique of Athenian democracy, one that is much more clearly sign-posted than the allusions in the myth.

In the process of this argument Plato identifies the knowledge held by the *basilikos* as *phronēsis*, and shows that understanding time, in the ability to identify the *kairos*, is the factor that demonstrates possession of this knowledge and the ability to deploy it. The *apodeixis* of kingship is concluded in this new discussion (277a1–2), but it does not take the form of an *apodeixis* in the sense of narrative account, and does not include narrative or historical examples, as the *apodeixis* does in the narrative of the myth. While Plato's contemporaries identified historical or mythical kings as paradigms of kingship, and ancestral laws as the best ones, Plato uses weaving, a low-status activity (albeit one with significant links to Athenian cult), as his paradigm for the activity of the *politikos* (279b1–5), and questions the emphasis on law, rather than the qualities of will of the ruler, as a means of assessing the quality of constitutions (293d4–e9).⁴⁶ Weaving was an established political metaphor, invoked by Aristophanes in his *Lysistrata* (Ar. *Lys.* 567–86), but Plato puts it to more sophisticated and precise use.

The paradigm of weaving makes a substantial contribution to exploring the problem of identifying statecraft as a superordinate activity, which the previous identification with herding did not (287b4–8). A range of activities can then be easily excluded from consideration (287–88). The wide range of subordinate and preparatory activities associated with the production of cloth can be associated with lowly tasks within the city (289c4–d2), enabling a tighter focus on the main pretenders to the craft, who are harder to distinguish from the craftsman. The producers of tools, makers of finished goods and artistic products, as well as those providing a range of services to the citizens, can be excluded, along with slaves and day-labourers (290a4–6).

As the search for a definition continues, further holders of subordinate knowledge can be excluded. Heralds and priests can be excluded as subservient interpreters of knowledge; the Eleatic Stranger touches on historical accounts in discussing two forms of kingship, the Egyptian priest-king (290d9–e3), and the Athenian 'archon-*basileus*, selected by lot' (τῷ λαχόντι βασιλεῖ, 290e6), who presides over the most revered customary and ancient sacrifices (e6–8). However, he removes them from consideration as holders of kingly knowledge. This step in the argument

lodges the point that not every current bearer of the title *basileus* will be regarded as such in the Eleatic Stranger's model.⁴⁷ The hints of Athens are brought further forward with the next set of claimants, the centaurs and other beasts, skilled sophists who are extremely difficult to distinguish from true possessors of the political and kingly crafts (τῶν ὄντως ὄντων πολιτικῶν καὶ βασιλικῶν, 291c4–5).⁴⁸

Distinguishing between those who do and those who do not possess the kingly craft, as Young Socrates urges the Eleatic Stranger to do, enables them, when surveying possible types of constitution, to assess which rulers possess knowledge. Each of the three numeric types is subdivided according to whether subjects are willing or compelled by force, wealth or poverty, law or lawlessness (291e1–5). Monarchy serves as the prototype, furnishing both kingship and tyranny; aristocracy and oligarchy provide a further pair, while democracy is not usually distinguished with separate types (292a1–3).⁴⁹

The point of introducing the typology here is to start a new line of argumentation that will show all these constitutions to be incorrect, to a greater or lesser extent, because of their rulers' lack of kingly knowledge. The Eleatic Stranger reiterates that kingly rule is a kind of knowledge (292b6–7), one of judgement and oversight (κριτικὴν . . . καὶ ἐπιστατικὴν, b9–10), as established in the earlier division, although at that point it was not clear what kind of knowledge it was. The Eleatic Stranger argues that this knowledge of ruling is extremely hard to acquire; if it can be identified, it can be used to separate its possessors from those claiming to possess it (292d5–8). It seems probable that the possessors will be very few in number, making it unlikely that any constitution where rule is shared collectively could ever be a correct constitution.⁵⁰

At the conclusion of this section of the argument Plato has identified the *basilikē technē* originally sought as *basilikē epistēmē*, eliminating the connotations of *technē* that do not serve his purposes, and linking *basilikē* more closely with knowledge, and associated with *phronesis* ('the kingly man with practical wisdom', τὸν μετὰ φρονήσεως βασιλικόν, 294a8). The pretenders are divided from the true king, now identified as 'the king with practical wisdom' (τοῦ φρονίμου βασιλέως, 292d6).

The new typology of constitutions provides an elegant explanation of the distinction between kingship and tyranny in their conventional senses, both of which are incorrect constitutions, and this enables Plato to separate his model of kingship, based as it is on knowledge, from these more familiar versions. The ruler with kingly knowledge generates a correct constitution that provides a paradigm for others to imitate, even though that imitation must take the form of choosing a radically inferior form of rule, rule by fixed laws.

Kingship and law

Plato offers a further challenge to accounts of kingship and political leadership that redefines the relationship between kingship and law, giving a subordinate role to the latter. The idea that a good ruler was a superior substitute for written law was well established in the discourse of kingship; Herodotus' Deioces gained his

reputation as a legal arbitrator who brought justice to lawless communities, while Xenophon's Cyrus identified the good ruler with a seeing law.⁵¹ But disregard for established law was also associated with tyranny, as in Otañes' critique of monarchy, so the Eleatic Stranger's claim seems paradoxical.⁵² Democratic kings in tragedy operate within the confines of the legal and democratic processes of their cities, as Aeschylus' Pelasgus did.⁵³ So it is unsurprising that Young Socrates finds this step of the argument difficult (293e6–7).

Here the Eleatic Stranger is responding to ancestral constitution arguments that argued that Athens should return to the laws of Solon or a similar earlier phase in the development of its democracy.⁵⁴ The way in which such second-best legalistic constitutions come about is examined through a return to the craft analogy and models of medicine and helmsmanship (298ad), arguing that it would be strange (ἄτοπα, Young Socrates agrees, at 298e4) for those arts to be carried out according to written laws or even unwritten ancestral custom.⁵⁵ This leads the Eleatic Stranger to distinguish between ruling through laws and ruling through craft (299e4–5), while replaying the trial of Socrates within the imagined Athens of strict rule by law (299bc).⁵⁶ While the previous steps in the division separated the king from his contemporary pretenders, sophists and politicians, these next steps separate him from pretenders in the past, the *nomothetai*, generators of law-codes (294a6–9).⁵⁷

The advantage of the fixity of written law-codes is that they are not subject to decay, a real risk in the entropy-riddled Age of Zeus. Imitating the rule of the knowledgeable king, who possesses *basilikē technē* (300e7), by establishing and keeping a law-code remains the best route to achieving the best possible rule for cities with incorrect constitutions and without a knowledgeable ruler (297d7–e4). Without a resident possessor of this skill, all constitutions, whether monarchies or otherwise, must fall back on written legal structures, and resist the temptation to change them. Again, one thinks of Solon and his departure from Athens to prevent the change of law, in Herodotus' mythicised account (1.29–33), but Plato does not encourage us to see Solon himself or any other famous *nomothetēs* as an exemplar, as would be likely in an ancestral constitution argument. The Eleatic Stranger does not envisage the regular appearance of a true king in contemporary cities, as they naturally arise among bees in hives (301d9–e2); the best option is for law-givers to run after the traces of the true constitution (e2–4).⁵⁸

The Eleatic Stranger concludes by showing how exercising *basilikē technē* or *epistēmē* resembles his paradigm of weaving, in constructing a solid social fabric from the disparate elements of the polis. Unlike the act of the exemplary synoecist, the true statesman's act of unifying the polis is not a one-time reorganisation, but a permanent and continuing activity. Thus the only way a polity without a true statesman-king capable of determining the *kairos* correctly can imitate the ideal arrangement is to continue with the original laws established by a lawgiver who did approach or attain the requisite knowledge.

Plato is thus left with a model of kingship that remains an abstract aspiration for rulers. The more likely form of monarchical rule is the imitation of the ideal constitution by a single ruler ruling willing subjects, in which case he can be called a king, even though he may not actually possess the *epistēmē* of rule, but

govern through belief (*doxa*, 301a10–b3). This gives Plato the potential to criticise the use of any historical or mythical king as an exemplar, unless that ruler can be demonstrated to be ruling through recognition of the *kairos*, based on his command of true *epistēmē*; persuading the crowd ‘through the use of stories’ (διὰ μυθολογίας, 304d1) for the purposes of persuasion is separated from the kingly art and classified as rhetoric (304c10–d1). Political teachings in the form of accounts of Theseus, Cyrus, Agesilaus and other exemplary kings, the kinds of stories used as exemplars by Xenophon and Isocrates, are reclassified.⁵⁹

The account of the political art in the *Statesman* separates Plato’s political vision from those of his contemporaries. Isocrates’ and Xenophon’s *paradeigmata*, the acts of kings and statesman from myth and history, or exemplary individuals themselves, are removed from consideration, so far as understanding of true kingship is concerned, and left to operate only as rhetorical devices. Plato emphasises the process of ruling in a much more abstract way, but the dialogue’s inventive cosmological apparatus overwhelms his argument. However, revised versions of the same apparatus would feature in further explorations of the science of rule, in the *Timaeus/Critias* and the *Laws*.

Plato’s account of historical process in the *Timaeus/Critias*

The centrality of Athenian political values to Plato’s analysis has become clear by the end of the *Statesman*, and the revision of his kingship model in the *Timaeus/Critias*, developing the story of the contrasting political cultures of Athens and Atlantis, makes this engagement more explicit. The *Statesman* myth hinted at Athenian themes such as autochthony, but here Athens becomes a location for the myth itself, in a text which appears to revise (and so post-date) the political argument of the *Statesman*, as opposed to its place in Plato’s metaphysical thought which has been used to place it earlier in Plato’s career.⁶⁰ While the *Timaeus* was for centuries the most important text in the Platonic corpus, the apparently incomplete *Critias* has received less attention from scholars, and has been under suspicion of inauthenticity.⁶¹

While the account of the doomed city of Atlantis has enjoyed a remarkable afterlife, perhaps a testament to Plato’s skilful invocation of powerful mythical elements, scholars have been less sure of how to treat the story – and what kind of story it is – in the context of Plato’s own political and ethical thought.⁶² The instability of genre in *Critias*’ account underlies the problem of precisely how reliable a vehicle for Plato’s argument the character is, and how seriously the methodological thought he expresses should be taken as a contribution to Plato’s political thought. These difficulties are compounded by the position of *Critias*’ account within the narrative framework of the *Timaeus/Critias* as a whole. The internal relationship between *Timaeus*’ cosmological story and *Critias*’ political one is, as Catherine Rowett has shown, a hierarchical one, which operates to the detriment of *Critias*.⁶³ But a second set of relationships pertains between *Critias*’ account, and the non-Platonic accounts of Athenian history outside the world of the dialogue that it criticises, and in this second structure *Critias* can be interpreted as a mouthpiece for

a Platonic critique. While the linguistic echoes between the respective proems of *Critias* and *Timaeus* provide a basis for comparing the respective strengths of history and philosophical cosmology as educators within a Platonic structure, *Critias*' analysis of others' thought positions this structure against rival external models.

Plato's *Critias* is an ambiguous character, representing Platonic arguments to the wider world of historiography, but, within the world of the dialogue, also representing the deprecated discipline of historiography itself; although he is not presented as the *Critias* of the Thirty, Plato must expect readers to be reminded of that historical person, his actions and his writings.⁶⁴ In the same way, his narrative blurs and merges history and myth; Kathryn Morgan points to possible readings of it both as a retelling of the Peloponnesian War as a myth, and as the insertion of Plato's own imaginary Kallipolis into the history of Athens.⁶⁵ However, Morgan's account underplays the extent to which Plato criticises and replaces rival historical accounts that attempt to provide moral exemplars.

For Plato, history, at least in its more rhetorical Athenian forms, is a failed educational methodology.⁶⁶ Sarah Broadie has suggested that the *Timaeus/Critias* mark the acknowledgement or engagement of the Academy with both cosmology and particularly historiography as genres of discourse that extend the range of Socratic intellectual inquiry. She notes that the dialogues contain 'an implied condemnation of the use of historical particulars as paradigms of the political ideal'.⁶⁷ As Broadie shows, Plato engages closely with Athenian historiography in this dialogue, often through the oblique strategy of replacing it with an imagined alternative history. Although there are textual links to both Herodotus and Thucydides, Plato's focus is on features of the historiography of his own time, particularly the use of leaders from the mythical or historical past as exemplars of good citizenship and individual virtue for citizens to imitate. But ultimately he rejects historiography as an approach that will produce knowledge. Broadie's further suggestion that the dramatic setting of the dialogue is within an alternative counterfactual history, in which the battle of Marathon has not taken place, and Athenian values and ideology have evolved differently, offers some insight into the complex ambiguities of Plato's literary use of and intellectual rejection of historical exemplars.⁶⁸ It also fits other counterfactual historical engagement by Plato, such as the funeral speech of the *Menexenus*, aptly described as a 'dialogue of ghosts'.⁶⁹

Plato exploits contemporary historiographic concerns with accuracy and the difficulty of knowing the distant past. These concerns had developed along with the writing of history itself. Herodotus had problematised the exploration of the distant past, attempting to document the transition from divine to mortal status in the kings of Egypt, and querying the ontological and epistemic distinctions made between kings and their subjects (2.142.3).⁷⁰ Plato here playfully takes up Herodotus' methodological concerns, his analysis of monarchy and his model of Egyptian exceptionalism.⁷¹ He uses them to challenge both the idealisation of monarchy and the use of historical examples in Athenian political argument. Plato's Egypt, not subject to periodic destruction, provides an alternative means of reaching back into the distant past.

Solon's attempt at explaining the Athenian story of Deucalion and Pyrrha to the Egyptian priest (*Timaeus* 22a7–b3) represents this problem. This flood myth tells the story of the origin of Greek society – a story which the *Statesman* myth both revises and replaces. Although he tries two methods of communicating the past, 'telling a narrative' (μυθολογεῖν, 22b1) and 'giving a genealogy' (γενεαλογεῖν, 22b2), he is unable to account for 'the most distant past' (τὰ ἀρχαιότατα, 22a5) of which he knows, and neither approach succeeds in impressing the Egyptian priest. The Egyptian's knowledge extends back to more distant epochs before the destructive cataclysms that, in Plato's models, limit Greek knowledge of the past.

The *Critias* interacts with both Athenian historical accounts and historiography, both in the proem (*Criti.* 106b8–108a4), and in the 'archaeology' (108c5–110c2). These passages develop a philosophy of history, meditate on the role of memory and show how Plato intends to replace standard historical accounts, at one level, and history itself, at another, with accounts that fit his own worldview. Kathryn Morgan identified the accounts that Plato wishes to replace as the *patrios politeia* pseudo-histories typical of the fourth century and offered by Isocrates and others, which populated the Athenian political imaginary with an idealised version of Solonian Athens.⁷² But these accounts also look further back, to the city's mythical founder kings. Plato's engagement is not so much with history itself as with the developing use of historicised foundation myth to manipulate the political imaginary, which he opposes almost as strongly as, in the *Republic*, he had opposed the use of drama, and for similar reasons.

The *Critias* attempts to deliver a Platonic anti-history to complement *Timaeus'* account of the cosmos, and sets the whole assemblage against accounts such as Xenophon's.⁷³ In the structure established in the *Timaeus*, Plato allocates the accounts of cosmology and history to two different speakers. By removing some of the features of the *Statesman* myth, such as the cosmic reversal, Plato avoids some of the difficulties that arose from its attempted integration of cosmology and political theory. The events described in the *Critias* take place in the same cosmic epoch as we are (unless one accepts Broadie's counterfactual setting), corresponding to the beginning of the Age of Zeus in the *Statesman* model, a significant shift. Although unknowable to history because of a cataclysm within this epoch that destroyed both Athens and Atlantis, this early period has the same kind of time, permitting historicity and politics for human actors (although the narrative stops just as the action threatens to begin). It indicates that political theorists should idealise the time early in the current epoch, when *daimones* still rule, disorder is minimal and the divine part of humans relatively undiluted.

Critias' opening *captatio benevolentiae* (106b8–108a4) argues that his task is harder than *Timaeus'*. He argues that it is easier to speak persuasively about the gods, of whom we know little, than about the bodies of men like ourselves, where the empirical experience of the audience requires a difficult level of accuracy (107b5–d5). Geographical descriptions, the part of the story that *Critias* does manage to tell, are easier to achieve. *Critias'* view is that 'depicting the undepictable' (107c–108a), the gods and the whole cosmos, is the easier task. This provides a rather sophistic counter to arguments presented by the *Statesman's*

Eleatic Stranger on paradigms (285–6) and by Timaeus on vision (45e–46a). But primarily it responds to Timaeus' own discussion of the problems of creating a reasonable image, an *eikōs muthos*, in the final part of his own proem (29b3–d3); Critias echoes Timaeus' language of resemblance (*ἀπεικασίαν*, 107b6; *ἀπεικάζειν*, 107e3) and accuracy (*ἀκριβές*, 107c6; *ἀκριβῶς*, 107d8).⁷⁴

The concern about *akribeia* and the extinction of memory brings out Plato's historiographical engagement here.⁷⁵ Plato embeds three criticisms of Athenian historiography into Critias' version of Solon's story. While Critias is telling a kind of history, it is one that reflects harshly on Athenian historiographical practices and their background in developments such as the sophist Hippias' chronologies, mocked by Plato in the *Hippias Maior*. Firstly, he follows Socrates' repudiation of accounts of the gods that portray them as dividing their rule 'through strife' (*κατ' ἔριν*, 109b1–2, cf. *Rep.* 2.379e3–380a5). The competition between Athena and Poseidon for Athens, judged by the king Cecrops, was a key event early in Athenian imaginary histories, and was also depicted on the Parthenon's west pediment, suggesting its importance in Athenian civic ideology.⁷⁶ The dialogue's dramatic setting at the festival of the Panathenaea, when the Athenians processed up to the Acropolis to celebrate Athena's relationship with the city, emphasises this; participants would have been confronted with this image as they entered the acropolis.

Secondly, it is gods not humans who found and settle cities (*κατοικίσαντες*, 109b1–c4).⁷⁷ In Plato's account, Athena and Hephaestus cooperate to found and nurture Athens because of their shared parentage and shared love of learning and skill (109c4–d1), through which they educated and developed their human subjects. This is rather different from the prevailing Athenian myth, in which king Erichthonios is born from the earth, watched by the founder king Cecrops, after Athena evades sexual assault by Hephaestus.⁷⁸

Thirdly, Plato presents the story as an exemplar of the limits of historiography. The fallibility of human memory and its inability to transmit stories from the distant past mean that these events and the acts of the founder gods were forgotten. This limited transmission explains the survival of the names of Erechtheus, Erichthonios and others up to Theseus, without detailed narratives to accompany them.⁷⁹ Only the names were preserved, and reused in later times (110a7–b2); this suggests a further critique of the capacity of myth for being retold and redeveloped in tragedy and other genres. Without memory of famous deeds, it is hard to construct exemplars of virtuous behaviour for imitation. The bare king-list cannot be transformed easily into a narrative account suitable for the transmission of civic values.

Although Plato implicitly criticises other historians' accounts of kings, he seems to try to avoid providing any exemplars of good kings within his own model, leading to the notorious disappearance of the philosopher kings from a *politeia* model of early Athens that otherwise mimics the structures of the *Republic*. The kings in the *Critias* are the 10 descendants of Poseidon who rule Atlantis (119c1–120d5), recalling the 10 tribes of democratic Athens, but as if it were still a pre-synoecism Athens of 12 cities.⁸⁰ The explanation offered of what happens to them is a model with temporal extension rather than a narrative; we learn of the declining

proportion of the divine within them (121a9–b7), which leads to the degeneration of the regime.

It is hard to see how Plato could recount the deeds of those Athenian kings whom he does include without replicating the exemplary use of mythical kings that he clearly wishes to reject, or creating a mimetic narrative of the kind that troubles him.⁸¹ Socrates' demand to see his ideal city in action cannot be delivered even in the temporal framework of Critias' account without violating Plato's views on narrative. Thus the *Critias* can deploy Herodotean analysis and ethnography, but stops short at narrative. This might account for the abrupt end of the *Critias*.⁸²

Kingship and time in the *Laws*

In the pseudo-historical narrative of *Laws* III, Plato sets out the weaknesses of historical individual human exemplars much more clearly. *Laws* IV responds to this with another myth in which good kingship is an attribute of the divine, and rule by such kings temporally distinct from the time of human history. Taken together, *Laws* III and IV serve to eliminate the use of historical individuals such as Agesilaus and Cyrus as positive exemplars in political theory.⁸³ Where his opponents have used such stories as case histories of individual virtue and political excellence, Plato points up the potential for weakness and decline, and rules out the possibility of long-term stability developing from the rule of virtuous kings.

In a final use of the divided temporal structure, kingship is reserved to mythical stories of divine kingship, and removed from the human sphere, just as the capacity to generate the best laws starts to require divine input, and the qualities of good constitutions are attributed to divine origins (*Leg.* 1.624a1–6). The Athenian Stranger, the least charismatic but perhaps most plausible speaker to voice these models, rejects all historical examples of *politeiai*, even the moderate and mixed Spartan ancestral constitution that seems promising in the first half of book III, as the basis for his proposed constitution, offering in their place a brief account of the golden age of Cronus (4.713a2–714b1).

The change from pseudo-historical narrative to mythical tableau happens at a pivotal point in the dialogue. In a response to the Cretan Cleinias' announcement of the plan to found a new colony on Crete (4.702bd), the focus of the trio's conversation switches from the critique of existing constitutions to the construction of a new set of laws for this project.⁸⁴ In this way the opposition of pseudo-historical narrative and timeless myth is integrated into the overall structure of the dialogue. That the model that will provide the example is extra-historical and utopian provides a link to the *Republic*, a relationship that is clarified by the description of a city resembling Kallipolis as one for divine not human existence (5.739ad).⁸⁵

This separation of human and divine furthers the dialogue's work as a response to kingship theories, firmly excluding the possibility of kingship from human societies and reserving it for the divine, while developing a structure within which individuals can instantiate the divine through adherence to the laws as products

of divine reason. In the same way, the equivalence of ruler and law suggested by Xenophon's Cyrus and Aristotle's virtuous ruler 'who is himself the law' (αὐτὸν ὄντα νόμον, *Pol.* 3.17.1288a3) is possible only for divine rule.⁸⁶

The development and decline of monarchical regimes

Laws III pursues an apparently historiographic inquiry, to find 'the cause of political change' (τῆς μεταβολῆς τὴν αἰτίαν, 3.676c6–7), a phrase that echoes the methodological concerns of historiographers such as Thucydides.⁸⁷ Andrea Nightingale argues that this phraseology contributes to 'a serious attempt to address the nature of history and the notion of historical causality', albeit one that 'falls short', but Plato's attempt should be seen as a critical engagement in which he positions his own, non-historical, models as better resources for understanding societies. The book's narrative follows a chronological and developmental structure over the *longue durée*, starting with the first primitive societies arising after a flood that happened ages ago (677a8–679e5), and ending with the decadence of present-day Athenian cultural decline through 'theatrocracy' (700a2–701d4). It also addresses historically based political theories one by one, associating each with a historical episode. To do so, Plato uses a form somewhat similar to that of the 'universal history', although spanning a much greater chronology.⁸⁸ Such histories offered a continuous narrative, from the return of the Heraclids to the Peloponnese to the present day, but the Athenian Stranger goes back much further than that, to the point where survivors emerged from the last general inundation (677a4–9).⁸⁹

However, the Athenian Stranger presents a history which is far from continuous; it selects episodes such as the Persian Wars for detailed and repeated scrutiny (in line with the practice of didactic history).⁹⁰ The structure of the Athenian Stranger's presentation is more complex than a simple linear chronology or annal. Like the histories it imitates and critiques, it changes gear at the point where myth or prehistory meets source-based history.⁹¹ This is marked by a pause in the narrative to restate a series of seven points about the nature of political authority (690a1–691a9), which echo the developmental structure of the narrative that surrounds them.

The starting point is not fixed precisely in time (676b9–c1); it is more conceptual, part of Plato's mythical apparatus. Accounts of destructive inundations are described as 'ancient stories' (παλαιοὶ λόγοι, 3.677a1–2), the veracity (ἀλήθειαν) of which is questionable, although Cleinias quickly accepts this version.⁹²

The Athenian Stranger's fundamental position is that political arrangements are subject to change; his summary of the rise and fall of cities echoes Herodotus (676b9–c4). But his account of political change explores his particular thesis about the need for a balance in society of monarchic and democratic elements, which he identifies as the two mother constitutions (693d2–e3). An account that begins as a developmental account of human society from the aftermath of a destructive cataclysm onwards becomes a list of repeated failures to generate political stability in conditions of growing social complexity, thus rendering the political theories that idealise each stage of development untenable.

The early family-based societies recall the Homeric Cyclopes, and Antisthenes' arguments that theirs was a just society (678a–680e), but in Plato's account simple pre-political societies cannot generate examples of virtue (or vice), which are properties of humans engaged in more complex societies (678b1–3).⁹³ Instead, such societies resemble the groups formed by birds when they follow a leader, typically a family elder, and become a 'single flock' (ἀγέλην μίαν, 680e2–3), echoing the herding vocabulary of the shepherd-king image. Such rulers, to the Athenian Stranger, 'rule as kings in the most just kingship of all' (βασιλείαν πασῶν δίκαιοτάτην βασιλευόμενοι, 680e3–4), a very different and much more limited construct than the elaborate rule of Xenophon's Cyrus. Such societies cannot provide useful exemplars for polis citizens to imitate; here they are the first kind of exemplar that will be replaced by the myth of the golden age.

The long exploration of the failure of the Dorian League (686b–89a), the alliance of the three cities ruled by the returning Heraclids, and the descent of two of those cities, Messenia and Argos, into tyranny, responds to Athenian pro- and anti-Laonist texts.⁹⁴ This threatens to over-balance the discussion with excessive detail, just as the *Statesman* and *Timaeus/Critias* myths were drawn into their own narratives. However, Plato controls the material more strongly here by halting the narrative and analysing a developmental model of claims to political authority (690a–c9), which provides a structure for the remainder of the historical argument.

Plato summarises his developmental model with a list of claims to political authority, linked to the types of societies featured in the narrative. The first three claims to authority emerge from the model: family hierarchy (690a3–4), social rank (a6), then age (a6–7). The next stages acknowledge greater social complexities; the rule of masters over slaves (b1–2) takes the list in a different direction, laying the ground for the fifth claim, the rule of stronger over weaker (b4–5), which the Athenian Stranger notes is a particularly powerful claim, supported by Pindar (a8). Both of these claims to rule might be associated with tyranny and imperialism. However, this claim is trumped by the sixth, the claim of those 'with knowledge' (τὸν δὲ φρονοῦντα, b10, against those 'lacking knowledge', τὸν ἀνεπιστήμονα); this, to the Athenian Stranger, is the natural and preferred order. The seventh contender, the use of the lot (c5–9), is dear to the gods and gives a clear indication of winners and losers in the struggle for power.⁹⁵

The Athenian Stranger introduces this list of conflicting claims to authority to structure the analysis of how the Dorian league failed, and to equip the reader to analyse the failures of Persia and Athens that follow. The existence of conflicting claims is a potential driver of *stasis*, but requires individuals to seek to enforce their own claims. The kings of Argos and Messene exemplified this, seeking to control the whole rather than to be satisfied with the half they held (690d1–e5). This points to a flaw in the traditional identification of kings with unity; kings must identify the correct whole to unify, for over-reach and greed on this account drive conflict and the fall of empires. And if kings are not pressing the correct claim to authority, that of wisdom (as philosopher kings would), their rule might be expected to crumble into tyranny and discord.

The question is whether kings or people are responsible for the beginning of political decline, and Cleinias quickly agrees that it is kings (690e7–91a2), as the suspended narrative of Spartan history suggested. The problem with kingship turns out to be the corrupting effect of absolute power; ‘there is no nature of a mortal soul (θνητῆς ψυχῆς φύσις) which can ever bear the greatest rule among men when it is young and not subject to scrutiny (νέα καὶ ἀνυπεύθυνος)’, (691c7–d1). The lack of proportionality is like fitting too big sails to a ship, or eating the wrong kinds of food (691c1–2), suggesting the problems of proportionality that were raised in the *Statesman* and will also run through Aristotle’s account of kingship.

Fortunately for Sparta, unlike the other members of the league (692b1–4), divine chance ensured a series of choices that distributed power so that only moderate amounts were held by individuals, and the claims to authority of age and seniority were respected. Political reforms (the institution of dual kingship, the laws of Lycurgus and the ephors) by a series of three ‘saviours’ combined, through divine chance, to ensure the stability of the state (692d5–a6).⁹⁶ The kingship ‘became a mixture’ (βασιλεία . . . σύμμεικτος γενομένη, 692a6–b1), which in turn served to preserve the other elements of the constitution. Individual human contributions, such as that of the much-praised Lycurgus, are minimised, while the divine element is emphasised.⁹⁷

This kind of change of constitution turns out to be positive, although *metabolē* often denotes change for the worse; while the discourse of kingship usually appeals to unity and constancy, here mixture and change are shown to be better, because they prevent the concentration of power in corruptible human hands. The lesson of Spartan history is that human monarchies can succeed only as a limited form within a mixed constitution, or as a transition to a mixed constitution based on the rule of law. The story of Spartan constitutional change is thus fitted to the Athenian Stranger’s model, under the provisions for good rule that he will specify in book IV. Sparta’s mixed constitution avoids the dangers of unmixed and unconstrained monarchy, but there is more to explore in the extreme cases of lack of political mixture exemplified by Persia and Athens.

Extreme forms of constitutions

Once the example of the mixed constitution has been established, the Athenian Stranger explores the two societies which represent its extreme polarities: monarchic Persia and democratic Athens. While these provide useful historical counter-examples, the Athenian Stranger evokes their use as abstracted examples in political theory. In the case of Persia, this is an encounter with the Cyrus of Greek political thought, from Xenophon and Herodotus, while in the case of Athens the links to the ancestral constitution critique of democracy are also clear.⁹⁸ For both Athens and Persia, good and moderate rule was replaced by extremism, monarchical and democratic tyranny respectively.

The account of the failure of Persian monarchy to provide a stable society takes Herodotus’ historical (although firmly shaped as a cycle) narrative and adds Xenophon’s analytical structure, spreading the arguments of the *Cyropaedia* across a

larger time frame and effectively filling the gap between Xenophon's narrative and the contemporary palinode of the *Cyropaedia*'s final chapter (*Cyr.* 8.8). Xenophon's opposition between the good Cyrus and his bad successors is doubled to include Darius and Xerxes, and Darius' regrettable failure to learn from the earlier generation and educate his son properly is strongly marked by apostrophe: 'O Darius . . .' (ὦ Δαρεῖε, 695d7–e2).

Plato's focus is narrower than Xenophon's broad inquiry into leadership; his concern is the structural relationship between Cyrus and the Persians that emerges as the problem of the final section, as they become his political deputies (694a2–5), and ultimately subject to the same Median influences. Firstly, Plato valorises Persian culture in Herodotean or Hippocratic terms, depicting the Persians as shepherds from a harsh land, able to withstand the hardships of military campaigning (695a); their political structures again invoke herding (ἀγέλας, 694e7) and shepherding (ποιμένας, 695a3–4).⁹⁹ But Cyrus fails to instil this culture in his sons, who are educated by women and eunuchs 'in luxury and without punishment' (τροφῇ ἀνεπιλήκτῳ τραφέντας, 695a5–b2), thereby causing the political instability that followed his death.¹⁰⁰

The enfeebled sons of Cyrus lose power to a usurper, but it is won back by Darius, not a king's son but the restorer of Cyrus' regime (695d1–3). Darius too, however, has failed to learn from history and has permitted his son Xerxes to be educated 'in kingly, luxurious style' (τῇ βασιλικῇ καὶ τρυφῶσῃ . . . παιδείᾳ, 3.695d6–7), so the cycle repeats. The negative connotation of *basilikē* here is particularly striking and unusual, especially in the context of education. Plato marks his departure from the Socratic tradition of kingship thought represented by Xenophon; in this revised model of kingship, the term *basilikos* applied to the human domain retains the characteristics of tyranny, and the surplus meaning of kingship is reserved to the divine. Plato thus presents Cyrus' rule as a phenomenon of power rather than of virtue, prefiguring Machiavelli's reading, and Cyrus becomes an example of the inevitable corruption of human rule.¹⁰¹

The Athenian Stranger explains the message to be drawn from this repeating pattern (697c5–698a7). The reason why the *politeia* declined was that 'they introduced more of the despotic element (τὸ δεσποτικόν) than was appropriate' (697c8–9) destroyed friendship and community in the city, and replaced it with the desire for personal power. This contrasts with the opposing case of Athens, where the super-abundance of freedom, and specifically the freedom to make one's own judgements outside the guidance of law, are proving destructive.

Like Persia, Athens has both a good and a bad form, though in this case the cycle does not repeat – no Darius-style insurgent restores its good *politeia*. The good Athens is a Solonian ancestral constitution, an aristocracy, while the bad one is an extreme version of democracy, *theatrokratia*, where public opinion and popular power are swayed through the spectacle of theatrical performance (701a2–3) that provides the wrong sorts of exemplars; Plato acknowledges the power of Athenian drama in constructing the political imaginary. As in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, performance and power are connected; in that work Cyrus performs his kingship, or his subjects, unable to perceive him directly, imagine him performing his kingship.

The democratic Athenians are influenced by theatrical spectacle, but when it fulfils their desire for novelty it corrupts their *politeia* and leads to extremism and instability.¹⁰² Elsewhere Plato praises the stable archaisms of Egyptian sacred music and art (2.656d1–657c2, 7.799a1–b8; restrictions on permitted depictions mean that Egyptian art has remained the same for 10,000 years, which the three discussants regard as an astonishing achievement of the art of the lawgiver and statesman.

Replacing the structure: Laws IV

The best human rule is that of law, but it can be achieved most expeditiously through the transformation of an established young tyrant by a lawgiver; working together, the two would set up the new regime (4.710d6–e2). The tyrant may provide the starting material for the philosopher's project, but the outcome is not the transformation of tyrant into king, as recommended in accounts such as Xenophon's *Hiero*. Instead, the tyrant creates political change by encouraging the citizens along the same path as he himself travels, whether to virtue or to vice (711b4–c2). The transformation of society is achieved not through the virtue monarchy model of the imitation of the king as exemplar, but through the protreptic activity of the tyrant, who is not a *paradeigma* in himself, but delivers praise and blame to the citizens who follow him. In contrast to virtue monarchy's underlying appeal to the cosmic elements of kingship that provide its surplus meaning, the Athenian Stranger deals with the analysis of power relations.¹⁰³

The Athenian Stranger asserts that a tyrant is the best choice to act as an agent of change, and ranks him above 'constitutional monarchy' (βασιλικῆς πολιτείας, 710e4), democracy and oligarchy, because the ideal starting point is the society where the fewest people have power. The peculiar ordering status of this tyrant figure is expressed in the description 'orderly tyrant' (τυράννου κοσμίου, 710d7); as the tool of the lawgiver, he is not a *basileus*, and cannot operate by appeal to the distinguishing features of kingship. In the world of the *Laws*, only the god who oversees the cosmos merits that title, given to him at 10.904a6. That the tyrant is called *kosmios* is paradoxical; being *kosmios*, or aligned with divine or cosmic order, is one of the features of kingship that separates it from tyranny.¹⁰⁴ Plato wishes to identify a sole ruler, without allowing him the full extent of the surplus meaning of *basileus*; he is *kosmios* in a limited sense, requiring the help of a lawgiver, rather than capable of generating cosmic order himself.¹⁰⁵

In the normal run of political affairs, the powerful lead their subjects along the same path as themselves; what the Athenian Stranger envisages is an unusual conjunction of circumstances that enables a lawgiver of unusual (and divine) intellectual quality to use the coercive power of a tyrant to enforce the change to the new laws (d6–e3). However, this is a rare occurrence; the only model cited does not refer to a young tyrant but to Nestor, a Homeric ruler famed for his extreme age.

The human kings and cities of *Laws* III cannot be useful models, and imitating them will cause further decline, whereas the divine kings of the Age of Cronus are suitable for imitation (4.712e9–713b7). The Athenian Stranger returns to the pre-political, post-cataclysm world before the polis to describe another, different

society in which the work of ruling is performed by *daimones*, as shepherds to human flocks.

The origin and transmission of this account of the Age of Cronus are left unspecified, unlike the *Timaeus*' elaborate transmission story of Solon's account. The Athenian Stranger introduces the myth to contrast with the historical accounts that have just been given (713a9–b4), distancing it with a *legetai* ('it is said . . .') construction but also marking it with historiographic and *politeia* language – 'there is said to have been an empire' (λέγεται τις ἀρχή . . . γεγόνεναί, 713b2), 'the cause of these events is said to be . . .' (ἡ δὲ τούτων αἰτία λέγεται, 713c4).¹⁰⁶ The myth is also identified as a rumour (φήμην, 713c2–3), as is the Noble Lie (*Rep.* 3.415d4).¹⁰⁷

Plato therefore attempts to separate myth and history here, sidestepping the problem of the *Critias* where history and political myth were too closely intertwined. The story of the Golden Age of Cronus is granted the status of a myth accepted by the polis, as a result of its persuasive power (714a8–b1). But it also reuses some of the language of shepherding and herding seen in the analysis of Homeric societies, and of Persia, (ποιμνίοις, ἀγέλαι, 713d2; ποίμνια, πρόβατα, 694e6; ἀγέλας, 694e7; ποιμένων, 695a2).¹⁰⁸ The recurrence of this language emphasises that this account is meant to replace both the mythical and historical elements of the *Laws* III narrative.

Humans become refounders and successors rather than the originators of political order (4.713a9–b4); their acts are *sunoiikēseis*, positioned in the recent past. This process neatly demotes Theseus, merely the synoecist of Athens (Th. 2.15), from consideration as an ideal king. The *daimones* who are appointed rulers, not the god who appoints them, are the significant political actors here (713c8–d2), a situation echoed in book 10, when political structures are reintegrated into the cosmology, or perhaps subsumed by it. There, god is labelled *basileus*, in response to the atheists, for whom gods are the product of human craft.¹⁰⁹ The *daimones*–human relationship is again likened to that of shepherds and flocks, that of a better kind over a worse, a more explicitly ontological and political message (713d2–5, cf. 10.906a2, b5) that will be expanded later. Here the message from the *Critias*, that humans can develop political skills, is absent. The *daimones* rule over cities (c8–d1), and their concerns and the benefits they bring are explicitly those of the polis (e1–3); they provide *eunomia* and justice and provide humans with blessed lives without *stasis*. But the golden age touches remain; this is also a life without evils and toil (e5–6), in contrast with rule by human rulers. The contrast is concluded in *Laws* X, where the Athenian Stranger describes the rule of the god-king (10.904a6) in terms of change, which ensures that souls are correctly positioned in the cosmos according to their virtue and the divine element within each (904c–905d), providing evidence that the gods care for us.¹¹⁰ The contrast between human and divine rulers is used to answer the final impiety, the claim that the gods exist but can be bribed; the Athenian Stranger disputes this, reusing familiar political analogies (906a) to show how the divine ruler is distinct from human craftsmen. Whether helmsman, shepherd or doctor (905e5–906c6), the human agent is inferior to the divine agent, and metaphors from one level cannot be applied to the other.¹¹¹

The representation of the mythical golden age in the *Laws* thus combines the features of the *Statesman's* Age of Cronus and the early stages of the Age of Zeus, in that humans live in cities but without individual toil. It envisages a heteronomous society, to which human contributions are limited.¹¹² Plato has moved on from the problem of how to generate the human version of the divine king; here the experiences of *Laws* III remain valid, in pointing to the disasters that follow from unmixed power in the hands of a single ruler or dominant class. While the idea of the shepherd king has been dismissed, along with the idea of the possibility of a virtuous human exemplar as guide for citizens, kingship remains Plato's metaphor of choice for describing the relationship between the abstract processes of reason and cosmic order and the humans who should demonstrate obedience to these processes.

Conclusion

Plato uses the descriptions of golden-age divine kingship in these dialogues to criticise the idealisation of recent historical and mythical kings in the political theory of his contemporaries. His model of kingship, whether accessed through myth or through argument, is harder for humans to imitate. Xenophon's shepherd kings, in comparison, are little more than refurbished tyrants, while myths of Athenian kings are too unreliable to serve as exemplars.

But it is far from clear that Plato's resistance to this political current had much effect on his contemporaries. Local historians would continue to expand and rewrite the stories of the early kings, and Isocrates would develop his use of Athenian and other kingship myth further. The politician Lycurgus was allegedly a student of Plato's, but his extensive use of mythical Athenian kings as exemplars of good leadership and citizenship suggests that Plato's political thought did not provide him with practical guidance.¹¹³ Human kings in the Hellenistic world would continue to seek to be venerated as gods, deified or granted peculiar ontological status. That this distinctive status was achievable by kings was reflected in the thought of Xenophon and Isocrates, distinguishing kings from subjects in terms of the achievement of virtue characterised more broadly and conventionally than the Socratic intellectualist version of virtue as knowledge.

Notes

- 1 See O'Meara 2017; Pradeau 2002.
- 2 Tarrant et al. 2011.
- 3 Morgan 2012: 228–33 argues that all three versions represent a rationalisation of myth, but here Plato presents mythical accounts as possibilities where history fails.
- 4 Federico Zuolo (2017) has drawn sharp distinctions between these myths, arguing that only the *Statesman* myth is what he identifies as a 'constitutive myth' that clearly separates the ages of Zeus and Cronus.
- 5 On the shepherd-king image see Brock 2013: 43–52. Against Michel Foucault's claim that the image had little relevance in classical Greek culture (Foucault 1981), see Haubold 2015 and Macé 2017.

- 6 Whether these ancient thinkers are aware of distinctive temporalities has been questioned: see Grethlein 2010; Koselleck 1985: 9–25 with counter-arguments in Rood et al. forthcoming.
- 7 Isocrates also addresses this is considering whether Philip of Macedon can imitate or surpass his ancestor Heracles: 'You will not be able to imitate all the deeds of Heracles', *Isoc. Phil.* 114.
- 8 The importance of modes of emplotment for modern history writing is emphasised by White (1975: 5–11, 1978: 104–6).
- 9 For example, *Plt.* 277bc. As Melissa Lane emphasises (1997: 13–21), the exploration of method is central to the *Statesman* and its metaphysical themes of unity, limit, proportion and mixture.
- 10 El Murr 2014: 97–103 analyses this argument in detail.
- 11 Plato uses both *epistēmē* and *technē* throughout the dialogue as terms for knowledge, but largely settles on *epistēmē* in its later parts (there is some reversion to *technē* in the closing section). It seems unlikely that slippage between these terms is accidental and inconsistent, as both M.L. Gill (2012: 178) and Melissa Lane (1997: 3 n.7) suggest. Lane notes that *epistēmē* is 'more prestigious', and is distinguished from *technē* in the *Sophist*.
- 12 Carlier 1978; Gray 2011c: 26–7.
- 13 Schofield 2006: 176–7. For detailed analysis of this argument, and the extensive scholarship on it, see Nawar 2018.
- 14 Isocrates' *Busiris* parodies the *Republic*, presenting the mythical figure of Busiris, known to Athenians as the Egyptian cannibal king who tried to eat Heracles, as the model of a philosopher king, and his society as the model for Kallipolis (*Bus.* 15–23) (Eucken 1983: 183–95; Livingstone 2001).
- 15 See Cavini 1995; Harte 2002 on the method of collection and division. D.A. White 2007 explores linkages between rule and metaphysics in the *Statesman*.
- 16 Brock 2013: 43–52; Miller 2004: 46–8.
- 17 *Rep.* 1.343b1–c1. Cf. Brock 2013: 43–52; El Murr 2014: 84–7, 111–12.
- 18 Blondell 2005 argues that this distinction is occasionally elided by the Stranger.
- 19 Plato exploits the polyvalence of *apodeixis*, which broadly means 'demonstration'; in a historiographic context, this may be a historical account with evidence, in a philosophical context it may be an argumentative proof; see Vidal-Naquet 1986: 285–302.
- 20 This is one factor in which the *Statesman* differs from Plato's other golden-age myths, where humans and gods are closer in kind; El Murr 2010, 2014: 170–2, and Blondell 2005.
- 21 Against Brock's observation that Xenophon appears untroubled by these issues (2013: 46–7), see Atack 2018b.
- 22 Rowe (1995: 233) contrasts Plato's rejection of the spontaneous appearance of the *politikos*/king, compared to the emergence of king bees in the hive (301d8–e4), with Xenophon's use of the metaphor to describe Cyrus' natural kingship (*Cyr.* 5.1.24).
- 23 The *Laws*' myth of the Age of Cronus repeats this: *παράδεδ' ἐγγεμεθα* 4.713c2–3; *γεγονέναι* 713b2, cf. *Phaedo* 114c7.
- 24 Horn 2012; Lane 1997: 116–17.
- 25 This is a Homeric allusion; these adjectives are used by heroes to describe the ontological status of the gods, at *Il.* 8.539, 12.323, *Od.* 5.218 (Odysseus of Calypso). Three-stage models: Brisson 1995; Carone 2004; Rowe 1996, 2010, dismissed by Ferrari 1995: 394 n.17; M.L. Gill 2012: 184–5 and further criticised by El Murr (2014: 145–53); the motivation of some of these account appears to be to restore a greater level of divine interest to the Age of Zeus than Plato's narrative suggests. Andrea Nightingale has suggested that the cosmology is not intended seriously, and proposed that the two ages should be read as a pair of dystopias: Nightingale 1996.

- 26 Blondell 2005, who reads the 'fleece' and 'fabric' as representations of the 'raw' and the 'cooked' of nature and culture, in anthropological analysis (Lévi-Strauss 1994). But while this reading is helpful for establishing the opposition, it suggests a one-way process of change which is alien to Plato's model.
- 27 Kahn 2009: 149–53, with Lovejoy and Boas 1997: 156; Empedocles Fr. 17.1–13, 16–17. Cameron Coates (2018) identifies the link with Empedocles as a possible pro-democratic element in the dialogue.
- 28 Mapping the *Statesman* myth to the Empedoclean cycle and reading it through Herodotus separates out the distinct qualities of founder kings, but Plato's attraction to the more cosmological aspects renders the separation between the two ages static. In the *Timaeus/Critias* version of this model Plato separates the cosmic and political levels of the myth, and replaces cosmic reversal with localised geological cataclysm, and can thus more easily generate a political account.
- 29 See Chapter 1.
- 30 See Chapters 1 and 2. Greek models of Persian kingship may have over-stated the importance of such practices; see Bowden 2013.
- 31 Cf. *Laws* III, where knowledge is the best but not the only claim to authority.
- 32 Cf. *Ath. Pol.* 3.2–3, 57.
- 33 *Ath. Pol.* 8.3, 21.
- 34 The ambiguity of Athenian autochthony claims are explored in Rosivach 1987; see also Chapter 2.
- 35 Lane 1997: 106, quoting Isoc. *Paneg.* 24 as an example of the politicised use of autochthony to which Plato objects.
- 36 Rowe (2010: 300–2) argues that the grey-haired babies represent the turmoil he identifies between the ages in his own three-stage model of Plato's myth, but also notes their Hesiodic links.
- 37 The Eleatic Stranger's concern here is to judge the choices they might have made; both choices are expressed as the apodosis of open conditions (*ei men . . . ei de*): Nightingale 1996.
- 38 El Murr 2014: 173–4; C. Gill 1979.
- 39 Castoriadis 2002: 93–4; Ferrari 1995: 393.
- 40 Their reversed lives may mean that they have an awareness that their own return to the soil is impending; however, the return to infancy may mean that this awareness is short-term; see Rowe 2010: 303–5.
- 41 Blondell 2005; see also Lovejoy and Boas 1997: 157–9.
- 42 Ferrari 1995: 393.
- 43 Brisson (1995: 350) identifies this as a reference to Demeter and Triptolemos, as well as Dionysus (through the gifts of grain and grapes, bread and wine). Proponents of a three-stage interpretation of the myth, according to which the present age of Zeus has the supreme god's hand back on the tiller, miss Plato's political pessimism and attribute too much positive concern in human affairs to the Olympian gods; cf. Rowe 1996, 2010 and criticism of three-stage interpretations in Arends 1999; Horn 2012. The apparent absence of gods from the present age matches the Hesiodic model; cf. Veyne 1988 on Greek rationalisation of myth. El Murr observes that autonomy is only possible in the Age of Zeus (El Murr 2014: 179–88).
- 44 Ferrari 1995: 391.
- 45 The initial assumption that distinct types of single-person rule could be conflated has been set aside.
- 46 Cf. El Murr 2014: 183 and, on weaving as metaphor, Lane 1997: 164–71. O'Meara 2017: 90–6 and Blondell 2005: 49–51 both connect weaving with the cult of Athena, and the preparation of robes for her cult statue.
- 47 On the links with Athenian politics in this section see Sørensen 2018.

- 48 This imagery opens a compositional ring that will be closed at 303c8–d2, enclosing a section in which Athenian politics are to the forefront. As El Murr notes, Athenian politics in this dialogue takes on the form of a ‘drame satyrique’, in which mythical creatures participate (2014: 221–3).
- 49 The typology will be revisited at 302a–303b, to complete the process of separating off those commonly thought to be political experts as mere ‘experts in faction’ (στασιαστικοὺς, 303c2).
- 50 The Eleatic Stranger appears to assume this, and does not consider the possibility of a Platonic academy churning out a large number of knowers of kingly knowledge; cf. the *Republic*’s assumption that the philosopher-kings will each rule in turn (7.520c1–3).
- 51 Sørensen 2018: 406–8.
- 52 Christopher Gill (1995: 293) notes the links between this section and the Herodotean constitutional debate.
- 53 See Chapter 2.
- 54 Attack 2010; Anders Dahl Sørensen has also explored the critique of the ancestral constitution in this part of the dialogue (2016: 90–9). Lane 1997: 151 argues that a commitment to the ancestral constitution does not require a commitment not to change the law, but this does not account for ancestral constitution arguments that presented themselves as opportunities to roll back democratic change (and decline) in the laws, and a return to a fixed Solonian law code.
- 55 Both the reference to ‘triangular tablets and stone pillars’ (κύρβεσι τισι καὶ στήλαις, 298d7) and ‘unwritten ancestral customs’ (ἄγραφα πάτρια . . . ἔθη, 298e1) point to the language of ancestral constitution arguments; the triangular *kurbeis* are particularly associated with the display of Solonian law: *Ath. Pol.* 7.1, Rhodes 1993: 131–5.
- 56 Socrates, already positioned as the sole practitioner of a political art in the *Gorgias*, now appears as a possessor of *politikē* or *basilikē technē*.
- 57 Athens’ *nomothetai*, a board originally established to ensure the restoration of democratic law after the rule of the Thirty, adjudicated on proposed new *nomoi* (Hansen 1999: 161–77).
- 58 See n.22 above. This rarity or impossibility of Plato’s ‘true king’, the one differing in soul and body (301e2), will be echoed in Aristotle’s exploration of the *pambasileus*.
- 59 On Xenophon’s Cyrus and his grasp of the *kairos*, see Attack 2018a.
- 60 C. Gill 1979; Owen 1953, 1973.
- 61 There has been a recent debate on the authenticity of the *Critias*, challenged in Rashed and Auffret 2017 and defended in Tarrant 2019.
- 62 C. Gill 1977.
- 63 Broadie 2012: 115–72; Osborne 1996: 185–9, especially 169–70; earlier at 120 Broadie offers a more positive account of Plato’s acknowledgement of historiography as a genre, but concludes her detailed consideration with a more nuanced analysis of his ambivalence.
- 64 Cf. Broadie 2012: 153–7.
- 65 Morgan 1998: 101–18, 2012: 243, cf. Morgan 2010.
- 66 Critias’ own invocation of Mnemosyne (*Criti.* 108c7–d2) suggests that he is aiming for a historical account, as fits his Thucydidean concern with accuracy and audience perception; C. Gill 1977: 288–91. Plato further criticises historical approaches through his argument in the funeral speech of the *Menexenus* and the critical history of political thought in *Laws* III.
- 67 Broadie 2012: 117–29, especially 120. Broadie’s detailed argument suggests that the framing of the *Timaeus–Critias* as a present for Socrates marks the acceptance of ‘cosmology and historiography’ as genres of discourse, either by Socrates or the Academy (167).
- 68 Broadie 2012: 129–32; see also C. Gill 2017: 14–18.
- 69 Vidal-Naquet 1995: 26, cf. Loraux 1981: 471 n.308.

- 70 Harrison 2003; Lloyd 1975–1988. The distinction between myth and history at Hdt. 3.122 is also significant.
- 71 Brisson 1987; Desclos 2003; Pradeau 1997.
- 72 Morgan 1998: 108–14, cf. Vidal-Naquet 1964.
- 73 Although the success of the Atlantis myth and its independent *Nachleben* perhaps constitute unintended consequences of its creation and presentation as a true story; see Vidal-Naquet 1995: 38–66, 2005.
- 74 Cf. *Ti.* ἀπεικασθέντος, 29c1–2; ἀπηκριβωμένους, 29c6. Applying readings of the *Timaeus* proem (Betegh 2010; Burnyeat 2005) to the *Critias* proem, which responds to it, is helpful.
- 75 Thuc 1.22; Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F9; Marincola 1997: 68–70. See Chapter 3.
- 76 This episode is not featured in any surviving *Atthis* fragments; although Xen *Mem.* 3.5.9 seems to allude to it, and the story appears in ps-Apollodorus *Biblio* 3.14.1; Gourmelen 2004: 176–80; Harding 2008: 22. The monarchical imagery on the Acropolis has political implications: Castriota 1992: 145–6; Hurwit 1999; Luce 2005.
- 77 E.g. Herodotus' Battus of Cyrene (4.150–159); Philochorus *FGrH* 328 Frs. 93–98; *MP* (*FGrH* 239) 1–2; Gourmelen 2004: 321–5. Founders are human, but require divine authorisation, such as an oracle from Delphi, for acts of foundation.
- 78 There is no surviving fourth-century textual version of this story; the fullest account is in Antigonos' *Historiarum mirabilium collectio* 12 = *FGrH* 330 F1, where it is attributed to Amelesagoras of Athens, an Atthidographer of doubtful historicity. There are however sixth- and fifth-century vase paintings which illustrate the story: see Loraux 1993c, 2000. Plato's version excludes sexual wrong-doing by gods, following the *Republic* II restrictions on myth.
- 79 This may acknowledge Praxithea (Euripides' *Erechtheus*), but Plato doesn't name the female characters.
- 80 *MP* (*FGrH* 239) 20, Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F94; Harding 2008.
- 81 Its setup parallels details which Rashed and Auffret regard as inauthentic, such as the description of Timaeus as a poet (*Criti.* 108b5, Rashed and Auffret 2017: 245)
- 82 Whether the dialogue is incomplete, or intended to end where it does, has been much debated. What *Critias* gives, although incomplete in its own terms, is not quite what Socrates asked for; while *Critias*' account breaks off at the point where mimetic narrative of events might take over (Broadie 2012: 128), its analytical model is complete (Pradeau 2002: 131–2; Pradeau 1997).
- 83 Detailed treatments of *Laws* III: Farrar 2013; Morrow 1960: 17–94; Nightingale 1999; Schöpsdau 1994; Weil 1959. Nightingale argues (312) that Plato is making a positive use of history, while Farrar shows Plato using historiographic method critically, cf. Schofield 2013.
- 84 Schofield 2010a explores the structure of the *Laws*; Van Harten (2003) links this passage to the cosmology of book X, which picks up themes of the myth.
- 85 Laks 1990; Schofield 1999b: 35–6.
- 86 Brock 2013: 196 n.89.
- 87 Cf. Hdt 1.5, Th. 1.23.; Nightingale 1999: 301; cf. Ephorus on the limits of history (*FGrH* 70 F9).
- 88 See Chapter 3, Marincola 2007; Morrow 1960: 70–1.
- 89 Plato's narrative, in subsuming events from separate narratives (such as the war monographs of Herodotus and Thucydides) into a single narrative, has more affinity with universal history, a historiographic genre contemporary with the writing of the *Laws* (*contra* Farrar 2013); Morrow (1960: 63–73) explores the differences between the *Laws* and Ephorus' account of Spartan politics (*FGrH* 70 F148 = Polybius 6.45.1–46.10). Luraghi 2014 argues that Ephorus' starting point was politically rather than chronographically driven.
- 90 On fourth-century didactic historiography see Pownall 2004; Hau 2016: 245–71.

- 91 Morgan (2012: 244–51) attributes this change to Plato's historical sources (she suggests Hellanicus), but such changes appear in several sub-genres of Greek historiography. See Chapters 1 and 3.
- 92 Weil 1959: 58–9 suggests that Plato is adopting a historiographic method, following the example of Thucydides, but this misses the playful tone with which the Athenian Stranger structures his narrative.
- 93 See now Prauscello 2017.
- 94 Isocrates' use of the myth of Cresphontes (*Archidamus* 16–21) exemplifies this; Bremmer 1997: 3–17.
- 95 Although this seems like a critique of democracy (and is taken as such by Rancière 2001), the Athenian Stranger presents divine influence exerted through chance as an important and positive element in political change.
- 96 Nightingale 1999. Plato is to some extent here rewriting the standard model, if Xenophon's *Lac. Pol.* is to be regarded as standard.
- 97 Cf. Hdt 1.65.3; Lycurgus treated as divine.
- 98 The account of Cyrus' Persia and its relationship to Xenophon is much debated. Dorion (2002: 373–80), Danzig (2002), and Hirsch (1985: 97–100) concur that Plato responds to Xenophon's account, albeit showing little respect for its details, cf. Schöpsdau 1994: 455–8.
- 99 Herodotus 9.122, cf. Hipp. *Aer.* 16.
- 100 Dorion 2003: 282–3 notes that Plato's account differs from Xenophon's; the use of *legetai* constructions (695c1, c4) underscores this.
- 101 Machiavelli 1988: Ch. 6, Ch. 26.
- 102 Folch 2016: 54–5.
- 103 The militaristic orientation of Cretan and Spartan society and their predisposition to all-out war has already been criticised (*Laws* 1.626b5–e5); there, as here, the Athenian Stranger will deflect the possibility of realist analysis with a turn to moral psychology and the ideal.
- 104 Schofield 1999b: 45–6.
- 105 And so, in the model of cosmic ordering introduced at 10.905–6, he has been correctly positioned by god in terms of his virtue.
- 106 Used again at 713c4, e7 (λεγόμενον), while the analysis from 713e3 onwards begins with λέγει . . . ὁ λόγος.
- 107 Rumou (φήμη) appears frequently in the *Laws*, often introducing speech acts without identifiable speakers, such as public opinion (*Leg.* 8.838c8–d1, d6; 9.878a5), or accepted myth (*Leg.* 9.871b4). Occasionally (in the plural) it refers to oracles (*Leg.* 7.792d2, *Phd.* 111b8).
- 108 Macé 2017 explores the continuation of this imagery in the selection of citizens for the new colony (*Leg.* 5.735b–736c).
- 109 Although Plato's use of *basileus* to describe god here seems more metaphorical than a direct invocation of a traditional concept of the gods as kings (cf. Mayhew 2010: 207–8 on metaphor in this passage). Plato also uses *basileus* metaphorically in the *Philebus*, where 'Mind is our king in heaven and on earth' (νοῦς ἐστὶ βασιλεὺς ἡμῖν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, *Phlb.* 28c7–8). While these metaphors bring in the values associated with kingship, Plato is pointing here more to the broader associations, the surplus meaning, and specifically the sense of an over-riding cosmic order, than to the precise political and institutional meaning of human kingship. The metaphor of rule cannot function identically for human (and therefore potentially bad) and divine rulers.
- 110 Nightingale (1999: 314–20) reads the cosmology of book X as a response to rather than contradiction of book III, where I read it as a continuation of the replacement of the historiography begun in book IV.
- 111 Mayhew 2008: 184–90.
- 112 Van Harten 2003: 134.
- 113 Allen 2000; Azoulay 2009.

7 ‘Total kingship’ and the rule of law

What might make the citizens of a polis choose to give up their own political agency and let a single individual make decisions for them? Aristotle’s *Politics* incorporates a thought experiment in which he attempts to identify what kind of person would make this a rational choice on the part of citizens who might otherwise enjoy the political autonomy of polis life. He imagines a man of superlative virtue, a king ‘sovereign over all things’ whose excellence is on a different scale to that of the ordinary citizens, and means that those citizens when ruled by him would flourish more than they would under a regime of collective decision-making in the polis.

In generating this model Aristotle responds to Plato’s thought, especially that on kingship in his later works, but also that of Xenophon and Isocrates, as well as the historians upon whom they all drew, and the epic texts and tragedies which also informed thought on how to create political communities.¹ Aristotle sets his theoretical thought on monarchy within his investigation of polis citizenship in *Politics* III, which draws on democratic Athens as its background.² He completes his radical contribution to the development of political theory with this critical engagement with the novel kingship theories proposed by other Greek political theorists of his time. Whether Aristotle thought that such a monarchy was possible within the polis has been the subject of much debate, most recently in David Riesbeck’s careful analysis of *Politics* III.³ Other scholars have suggested historical conditions, and candidate kings, which could be said to meet Aristotle’s criteria. But the figure Aristotle identifies belongs as much to the Greek political imaginary as to history.

Aristotle’s *pambasileia* and the metaphysics of monarchy

Aristotle, in responding to the rich discourse on kingship that permeates Greek political thought, addresses both the ‘virtue’ model in which the king is the paradigm of virtue, and the ‘cosmic’ model in which the king instantiates and guarantees order, and links the political microcosm to the macrocosm of the universe.

Both these theories of kingship, in separating the individual king from the collective citizenry, invite further, more abstract thought on the political ontology of kingship in Greek political thought: the importance of the king in the foundation

of the polity; whether the king can be considered part of, or separate from, the polis; and the relationship between polis and cosmos. In addressing these aspects of existing kingship theories, Aristotle explores the metaphysics of monarchy, as part of the long-running mereological problem of parts and wholes in the construction of the polis (cf. *Politics* I), a discussion which also involves the theme of distributive justice which we have already seen is closely linked to the discourse of kingship.

Politics III's highly theorised discussion of monarchy in the extreme form of *pambasileia* (3.13–18) is presented as a counter-example to the 'republican' phenomenon of equal citizens organising their affairs in a polis context reminiscent of Athens (3.1–12), and culminating in the exploration of the 'wisdom of the multitude' (3.11.1281a42–b10). It also explores the difficulty that arises when the same notional person is simultaneously the conduit of cosmic order and the instantiation of virtue, and whether if such a person existed, they could be accommodated within the structures of the polis.⁴ Aristotle identifies and analyses a problem of inequality and incommensurability that arises when an individual within the polis possesses capacities sufficiently different in quantity or distinct in quality from those of other individual citizens to prevent that individual from being considered a member of the same class. In this sense, the king cannot belong to a group of citizens as their equal, and thus cannot be accommodated within the polis, just as heroic figures such as Homer's Achilles could not be contained by the collective structures of the Achaean camp.

This argumentative context within the *Politics* is given insufficient weight in one group of existing interpretations of these chapters, which interpret *pambasileia* in historical terms, as a response to the rise of Macedon and Alexander the Great, and as an attempt to theorise the relationship that would develop between Hellenistic kings as external rulers over poleis that maintained their pre-conquest structures. But Aristotle's concern is with relationships within the polis structure, not those extending beyond it. *Pambasileia* has also been seen as part of Aristotle's political sociology of books IV–VI.

Such a focus fails to account for metaphysical and ontological implications of monarchy central to Aristotle's analysis of *pambasileia*.⁵ While the historical phenomenon of the powerful individual ruler contributed to Aristotle's interest in theorising monarchy, his fivefold typology of kingship (and exploration of tyranny) makes it clear that many of the historical examples typically cited in fourth-century texts as provoking interest in single-person rule, such as Jason of Pherae, could not be considered as candidates for *pambasileia*, even though Xenophon had identified him as 'the greatest man of his times' (*Hell.* 6.4.28). The often-tempestuous careers of rulers such as Jason of Pherae, and the single-person rule in various forms across the cities of Greek Italy and Sicily, and the *ethnos* states bordering the Greek world, provided source material and examples for all fourth-century Greek political theorists.⁶ Aristotle engages with this existing discourse, in which Macedon is already a presence, based on interest in Alexander's predecessors Amyntas III and Philip II, and in Dionysius I and II of Syracuse, a further favoured example, but none of these historical figures is considered, or could be considered, as a member

of the elusive category of the *pambasileus*.⁷ Their excellence is partial and does not meet the essential criterion of incommensurability.

A second set of modern responses focuses on the instantiation of virtue in the absolute monarch, and interprets Aristotle's account to identify him as a monarchist in a similar vein to other Greek theorists of monarchy.⁸ However, reading *Politics* 3.13–18 as a response to Isocrates' and Xenophon's model of virtue monarchy shows that Aristotle is criticising that model rather than supporting it, and exploring the tensions between the virtue model of monarchy and cosmic elements that persist within it.⁹ He further includes a critique of Plato's response to the virtue monarchy model (in *Laws* III) and his appropriation of the cosmic monarchy model.¹⁰

Just as Isocrates, Antisthenes and Xenophon used contemporary and historical exemplars idealised to the extent that they scarcely differed from their more obviously mythical or imagined monarchs, so even notionally empirical parts of the *Politics* feature kings from foundation myth, such as Athens' Codrus (and orientalised versions of Persia's Cyrus), alongside more straightforwardly historical examples (*Pol.* 5.10.1310b31–40). The process of historicisation seen in the Attidographers is complete. For Aristotle, kingship is both a theoretical construction that explains the origin of the political community (1.2), and a continuing presence within the Athenian political imaginary.¹¹

One of Aristotle's innovations is to label the extreme form of monarchy *pambasileia*, an abstract term he derives from poetic addresses to important gods, and which compounds the Greek adjective *pas* ('all') with the noun for kingship.¹² The noun *pambasileus*, and its feminine form *pambasileia*, both appear in earlier works as ritual titles of gods. Zeus in a fragment of the seventh/sixth-century BCE lyric poet Alcaeus is *pambasileus*, and, more significantly, the Clouds in Aristophanes' *Clouds* are addressed as both *despoinai*, the feminine form of *despotēs*, and *pambasileiai* (ὦ δέσποιναί . . . ὦ παμβασίλειαι, 356–7).¹³ Both nouns also perform the same function in the Orphic hymns, Hellenistic poems from a religious cult.¹⁴ Aristotle acknowledges the mystic and Pythagorean tone of the religious language of the *Clouds*, in which Socratic philosophy is presented as being in the service of a mystery cult and the chorus turn out to be goddesses of justice.¹⁵

Pan compounds usually imply excess and extremity, suggesting that something is beyond the size appropriate to its apparent kind. Xenophon's Pantheia is an extreme of (divine) virtue.¹⁶ For Plato, 'all-great' (πάμμεγα, *Ti.* 26e4–5) describes both the length and the totalising claims of Timaeus' speech, while the division of weaving in the *Statesman* is 'all-long' (παμμήκης, *Plt.* 286e1).¹⁷ Aristotle echoes this language of measurement and comparison in his discussion of political proportion and commensurability. A third resonance comes from the Pindar fragment, 'Custom king of all' (νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς, Fr. 169.1), which Plato's Callicles cites to argue for a law of nature in which stronger rule the weaker (*Grg.* 484b1–c3).¹⁸

These resonances of *pambasileia* link Aristotle's concept to the powerful imagery that is associated with the concept of kingship, its irrational and mythical elements, which attach to this extreme form in particular, and imbue it with links

to cosmic ordering and the divine.¹⁹ However, in his detailed discussion Aristotle identifies the kind of rule that might be exercised by such a king in more everyday language. He describes the rule of 'the king who does all things according to his own will' (τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ βούλησιν πάντα πράττοντος, 3.16.1287a1–2) or 'one man sovereign over all' (ἓνα . . . κύριον . . . πάντων, 3.15.1286a1–2).²⁰ Most translations suggest that πάντων ('of all'), governed here by the adjective κύριον ('sovereign' or 'master over'), refers to things, rather than persons.²¹ But with the collapse of the distinction between household and polis, the domestic force of *kurios*, a power exercised over persons, leaks into the relationship between ruler and ruled in the city, where one is more properly *kurios* over an office or institution.²² If the form of rule implied by *kurios* is kingship, it is properly exercised over persons not offices or objects, and implies both ruling and mastery. Once more, Aristotle explores the consequences of Plato's assimilation of all forms of rule, in order to reject it.²³

Aristotle develops a metaphysics of monarchy, attempting to answer questions about one and many, citizen and polis, ruler and ruled, and the distinctions between them in highly abstract terms.²⁴ The first problem addressed is the structural one of the relationship between the citizen and the polis, and whether the polis itself is a single entity, 'Athens', or, as typically expressed in Greek, the plural citizens, 'the Athenians'.²⁵ A king, as the instantiation of one-over-many, could solve this difficulty, through the founder monarch's unification of the body politic (as in Theseus' synoecism of Athens). But Aristotle's abstract outline of the city's development (1.2.1252b15–27) provides an account of the foundational but diminishing importance of kingship in the development of Greek politics. Here he emphasises that the 'original founder (ὁ δὲ πρῶτος συστήσας) is the one responsible for the greatest good' (1.2.1253a30–31), but this is a single instance always set in the distant past. As with the claims to authority Plato reviews in the *Laws*, the claims of kingship belong for Aristotle to more primitive societies, and have been superseded in the complex form of the polis.

Aristotle also argues that the polis is a single entity, the natural result of natural processes, and logically prior to the individuals from whom it is formed, a part of his argument that has continued to trouble readers of the *Politics*. We can set Aristotle's natural polis against Hobbes' Leviathan, who is a 'mortall God' and 'Artificiall Man'.²⁶ Does Aristotle's *pambasileia* describe the rule of an artificial person acting as sovereign? Whether political and legal entities are natural or artificial is an open debate at this time, if Plato's arguments against the atheists in *Laws* X are any guide to fourth-century issues in political thought.²⁷ The author of the Anonymus Iamblichi identified the single ruler as 'made of steel' rather than 'made of flesh', asserting that such a position was unnatural (Anon. Iamb. 7.14–15). If there is a sovereignty relation in the self-governing Greek polis, working out what persons or entities it connects is complicated by the ambiguous reference of *kurios* already noted.

Problems of unity and plurality are both central to Greek political thought and echoed in the metaphysical concerns of Plato's Eleatic Stranger, whose Eleatic cosmological and structural concerns permeate the *Statesman*. The view that unity

is better than or prior to plurality is persistent, seen in metaphysical *endoxa* cited by Aristotle, such as the Pythagorean table of opposites, and in the priority of the circle and sphere as shapes.²⁸

While present-day political theorists largely wish to reject or play down the presence of such metaphysical/ontological concerns in Aristotle's political thought, this approach denies him the use of his own classificatory structures.²⁹ When Hobbes began this line of argument, it was as an attack on Aquinas, and there still seem to be sectarian religious tinges to the debate now.³⁰ Contemporary political scientists in the US such as Stephen Salkever contrast empiricism with metaphysics as mutually exclusive rival methodologies for Aristotle's political science.³¹

The second ontological question ponders the nature of the king, the special individual who brings unity and order to the polis and is thus differentiated both in his function and his capabilities from the citizens he rules. How can one man be seen to be worth more than many others, and what kind of characteristics legitimate such judgement? On what authority can some individuals dispense redistributive justice? What distinctive qualities entitle the king to his special status, or do extreme quantities of the same qualities as subjects do the same? While polis ideology broadly led the Greeks to reject the monarchical models followed by *ethnos* states and empires such as Egypt and Persia, the fourth-century development of a theory of virtue monarchy reintroduced the question of kingship for the Greek polis.

Aristotle's discussion of monarchy

Aristotle's detailed discussion of monarchy fills out the final five chapters of book III, which as a whole is dedicated to exploring the role of man as citizen within a polis framework. The discussion of *pambasileia* is not simply an argumentative exercise or *reductio ad absurdum*.³² These chapters explore a possible negation of the summation or 'wisdom of the multitude' argument (3.11.1281a40–b3), which argues for the superiority of mass deliberation within the polis over individual decision-making, echoing the cases made by Plato's Protagoras and Thucydides' Pericles.³³ The usual counter-case, denying political capacity and judgement to the masses, was more often made by Greek thinkers, as seen in Herodotus' and Thucydides' criticisms of Athenian democratic decision-making and exaltation of the epistemic capabilities of good leaders.³⁴ In 3.13 Aristotle explores the contrary view, and positions *pambasileia* as the political consequence that would follow if one man were actually superior to the multitude in respect of political decision-making, or possessed an excellence incomparable with that of other humans (3.13.1284a3–17).³⁵ But can humans really differ as much as lions and hares do, in Antisthenes' anecdote (3.13.1284a15–17), so that it would be ridiculous for the powerful to admit the weak to political equality?³⁶ And if any humans met this standard, would that make them a beast or a god, as in *Politics* I?³⁷

The nature of incommensurable excellence is also problematic. Aristotle's text provides some guidance here; he is concerned with those who are 'unequal in excellence, that is political capability' (ἄνιστοι . . . κατ' ἀρετὴν ὄντες καὶ τὴν

πολιτικὴν δόναμιν, 3.13.1284a9–10), limiting the range of virtue to that exercised in political activity.³⁸ The inequality created by the man of supreme virtue is clearly specified as and limited to that arising from excellence in political capability. Elsewhere, Aristotle seems more concerned by the size or type of the gap, and the metaphysical consequences of such distinctions between notionally equal political actors, than by the precise quality or qualities that cause it. This problem is opened here at the start of the discussion and remains in play until the close of the book.

With the idea of the man of incommensurable excellence in play, Aristotle starts by surveying the known forms of monarchy (3.14.1284b40–1285b19). These forms of monarchy are actually much less straightforwardly historical than he presents them, as often happens with supposedly empirical evidence in the *Politics*.³⁹ Spartan kingship (1285a3–16) is a limited form, more a combination of generalship and priesthood, while barbarian kingship is more akin to tyranny (1285a16–29); no example is given, but we can all read Persia as the intended archetype for this form.⁴⁰ The third form is *aisumneteia*, an archaic form of elective tyranny (1285a29–b1), of which Pittacus of Mytilene, perhaps better known as a sage and proponent of virtue, provides the example.⁴¹

The fourth type of monarchy, instantiated by the hereditary monarchs of the Heroic Age (1285b3–b20), is more truly *basilikē* than the previous forms, because it features kings whose authority is established 'by election' (αἵρεταί, b3) or 'ancestry' (πάτρια, b5), and who rule 'within the law' (κατὰ νόμον, b5) over 'willing subjects' (ἐκόντων, b3; ἐκούσiai, b5). This type of monarchy resembles Xenophon's definition (*Mem.* 4.6.12), except that it is positioned firmly in the past, and seems to identify a king such as Agamemnon.

These heroic kings acted as benefactors (εὐεργέτας, b6) to their communities, and as agents of political 'unification or colonisation' (τὸ συναγαγεῖν ἢ πορίσαι χώραν, b7–8). A further element of their rule is the administration of justice; 'they judged criminal cases' (τὰς δίκας ἔκρινον, b11). But this form of monarchy was itself subject to political change, as the evolution of the polis stripped away the powers that citizens consented to transfer to their *basileis*. It seems that kingship already floats somewhere between the historical and the mythical; neither the sage Pittacus nor the implied Homeric characters of the fourth type are strictly historical, and much of the detail of kingship in the subsequent examination of *pambasileia* refers to kings who fit this fourth, heroic, type.⁴²

So, when Aristotle goes on to introduce a fifth and radically different form (1285b29–33), this distinction is not as strong as he suggests.⁴³ He now focuses on the mereological and structural considerations in play from book I: 'whenever there is a one who is truly sovereign over all', in Barker's translation (ὅταν ᾗ πάντων κύριος εἷς ὢν, 1285b29–30).⁴⁴ This invocation of both sovereignty and structure is echoed at the close of the discussion at 3.17.1288a26–28. Although it may be risky to make use of composition or style in the analysis of Aristotelian texts, this does look like ring composition, both demarcating a section and emphasising what is important within it.⁴⁵ What is important about the supreme monarch is his structural function in the ordering of society, the way that he is set over the many.

Platonic and Aristotelian arguments against monarchy: Pol. 3.15–16

Between the listing of forms of monarchy in 3.14 and the closure of the discussion of the supremely virtuous man lie several pages of somewhat disorganised argumentation. Nineteenth-century textual critics suggested that 3.15 and 3.16 were doublets, two versions of the same material.⁴⁶ However, a careful reading reveals subtle differences that contribute to Aristotle's argument. The two chapters have the same structure, with the analysis of a theoretical problem followed by historical problems, but there are subtle differences of approach that are worth exploring. Chapter 3.15 explores the Platonic question of whether it is better to be ruled by the one best man or the law, and provides Aristotle's response to this problem. Chapter 3.16 re-examines the question with a closer focus on the specific difficulties caused by the possibility of a *pambasileus* within a city of equal citizens. Each chapter also engages with historiographic *topoi* of kingship and tyranny, linking Aristotle's analysis into the broader discourse of kingship.

Aristotle's first move at the start of chapter 3.15 is to simplify the analysis of kingship by dropping the intermediate forms of monarchy to focus on the extremes, which he identifies as Spartan monarchy and *pambasileia*.⁴⁷ The Spartan kind is then dismissed as a 'permanent generalship' (στρατηγὸν αἰδίον, 3.15.1285b38–39), and only the final case of *pambasileia* remains under discussion, identified as a form of constitution – but one which gives rise to some difficulties.⁴⁸ Is it better to be governed by the best man or by the best laws (1286a8–9)? This question points back to the Eleatic Stranger's assertion in the *Statesman* in favour of the best man, and continues Aristotle's critique of Plato's arguments.⁴⁹ Plato there identifies the best man as the possessor of *basilikē epistēmē*, who rules without recourse to written law (*Plt.* 294a6–8).⁵⁰

Plato is very clear that the kind of knowledge required by the expert statesman will be achieved only by a small minority, just like other forms of expertise (e.g. *Plt.* 300e7–10); the more usual outcome will be second-best imitation of this rare knowledge. Plato's model fails to satisfy Aristotle as a sufficiently robust response to the identification of kingship and law. The integrative function of the Platonic statesman, transforming the disparate many citizens into a single body, and the specialist knowledge he requires, set him apart from non-rulers without this capability and knowledge to a suspicious degree. Plato may have failed to leave the divine kingship model altogether behind, transforming the ontological distinction of the shepherd king into the epistemological distinction of the expert king, the king who possesses *basilikē epistēmē* in the best case. For in exercising his knowledge he may be exhibiting the ordering capabilities of a cosmic king.

Aristotle agrees that there are limits to the competence of law, but disagrees with Plato about the solution to this gap. Firstly, Aristotle wants to limit the validity of laws established by a good lawgiver, so that they are sovereign only insofar as they do not deviate from the ideal (3.15.1286a21–23). Secondly, Aristotle foresees the necessity of making judgements outside the established legal framework to deal with complex cases (a24–25), although unlike Plato he does not regard the ability to decide such cases as the preserve of the *politikos*.⁵¹ He is much less

sanguine than Plato about the possibility and reliability of single-author law codes; elsewhere in the *Politics* he downplays the usefulness of the ideal constitutions created by more recent political theorists. The archetypal lone lawgiver, Lycurgus of Sparta, receives special criticism from Aristotle, who points out that his constitution fails to deal adequately with women, and was most likely plagiarised from the Cretans.⁵²

Rather than rely on the *politikos* to decide difficult cases that cannot be settled with reference to law, Aristotle prefers mass decision-making bodies. He returns to his previous argument for the wisdom of the multitude (3.11.1281a39–b15), although here he inverts the point made in the earlier chapter; there, the addition of good men to the crowd improved the mixture (3.11.1281b34–38), whereas here the addition of bad men or emotions cannot destroy the overall capability of the group (3.15.1286a31–33). Perhaps responding to Plato's realisation in the *Laws* that there was the possibility of corruption of the *politikos*, Aristotle argues for the greater incorruptibility of the multitude (3.15.1286a31–b1); like a larger body of water, the multitude dissipates pollution, while a single man is subject to his passions. If the judging group is limited to those who are 'good both as citizens and as men' (ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ πολῖται, a39), rather than the 'crowd' (ὄχλος, a31) originally envisaged, the resistance to corruption may be even greater.⁵³

This goes against the traditional view that one man judging on his own is less likely to suffer from *stasis* than the multitude: 'but while they suffer factional strife, the one man is without faction' (ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν στασιάζουσιν ὁ δὲ εἰς ἀστασίαστος, 3.15.1286b1–2), a view that Ross places in quotation marks as the position against which Aristotle argues, treating it as an *endoxon*.⁵⁴ Plato supports this view in the *Republic*; the guards' community of property renders them *astasiastos* (5.464e1), whereas the oligarchic man's character flaws render him liable to internal *stasis* (8.554d9).⁵⁵ In the *Statesman* citizens who participate in politics while lacking expert knowledge are described as *stasiastikous* rather than *politikous* (303c2). In the *Laws*, Plato shifts away from entrusting judgement to a single corruptible man (rejecting human monarchy beyond the temporary *kosmios turannos*), moving closer to Aristotle's position, but without adopting his arguments against monarchy.

Aristotle goes on to consider whether it is, 'as it seems to some', 'against nature' (κατὰ φύσιν) for one man to rule over those who might, as equals, expect a turn in ruling, 1287b9–12). This presentation parallels that of *Politics* 1.6, on slavery by convention, where Aristotle presents the arguments congruent with his own as the views of others. Aristotle seems more willing to accept that slavery is natural than that monarchy is, presumably because the typical polis contained more slaves than monarchs. But again, the issues of *Politics* 1.2 and its political ontology remain – what qualities determine that an individual is outside the range of what might be considered human?

In chapter 3.16 Aristotle begins to analyse the specific arguments for *pambasileia*, the identification of qualities that a single ruler might need as the one who is sovereign and governs at his own arbitrary discretion (1287a1–2, 9–10), in the place of the rule of written law or the greater capabilities of the assembled

mass of citizens. Aristotle presents arguments against *pambasileia* as emanating from others ('some people think', δοκεῖ τισιν, 1287a10), but, as these other anti-monarchists seem to be well-equipped with Aristotelian arguments, he moves away from the Platonic focus on the factors such as knowledge that distinguish the king from his subjects, towards an analysis of the consequences of the gross and 'unnatural' (οὐδὲ κατὰ φύσιν, 1287a10–11) inequality represented by the *pambasileus*' presence within the polis.⁵⁶

This issue was first trailed in the assessment of the virtuous man in 3.13; there, he was said to be wronged by being deprived of rule by those unequal to him in virtue, in terms of political capability (3.13.1284a9–10). But Aristotle is here more concerned with the proportionate treatment of equals and the assessment of proportionality between unequals, than with the wrongs done to the notionally unequal. Equality and like treatment of natural equals are fundamental within the polis, and presuppose law, because the arrangement that delivers them is itself law (1287a18). Aristotle is concerned to ensure that human passion is eliminated from this process, and law is a mechanism for ensuring this, because, he claims, 'law is reason without desire' (ἄνευ ὁρέξεως νοῦς ὁ νόμος ἐστίν, 1287a32). He thus sets out a case against *pambasileia* that would remain valid even if an actual *pambasileus* were found; the historical examples from the previous chapter provide a process for dealing with the unequal within the city, by forcibly excluding them.

Historical examples

Aristotle follows his theoretical arguments in both these chapters with counter-examples of monarchy's practical problems, drawn largely from Herodotus, possibly filtered through the *Cyropaedia*. Aristotle's historical model of kingship (1286b8–13) places it in the past, when good men were more rare and it was more likely, in the context of smaller communities, that one man would be outstanding as a benefactor and take responsibility for the cohesion of the community.⁵⁷ However, these examples are abstracted and theorised from other texts, rather than empirical observations.⁵⁸

Chapter 3.15 closes with two prime concerns raised in Greek discussion of kingship and tyranny, from Herodotus to Xenophon, succession (3.15.1286b22–27) and the physical protection of the monarch (3.15.1286b27–40).⁵⁹ Herodotus, within the parameters of his over-riding theme of the decline of empires, is concerned about the diminishing returns offered by dynastic succession; for every Cyrus a Cambyses, for every Darius a Xerxes; Plato took up his concerns in *Laws* III.⁶⁰ Herodotus' history contains multiple case studies of elective monarchy; or at least those monarchs of whom he approves, such as Deioces, Psammetichus and Darius, are selected by some sort of group deliberative process, even if a highly oligarchical one. Xenophon, too, in noting the decline of Cyrus' empire, presents Cyrus' sons as lesser men than their father (*Cyr.* 8.5).

The concern about using bodyguards is more typical of Greek worries about tyranny and the practical impossibility of kingship as a phenomenon distinct from tyranny. The presence of a bodyguard symbolised the separation of ruler and ruled;

bodyguards might be needed to protect a tyrant from overthrow, as in the case of Hiero (Xen. *Hiero* 6.9–11, 10.1–3), or to shield a king from direct interaction with his citizenry, as with Herodotus' Deioces (1.99.1) and Xenophon's Cyrus, who has a double bodyguard of eunuchs and hand-picked elite troops (*Cyr.* 7.5.58–68).⁶¹

The topos examined at the close of 3.16 is the more Aristotelian topic of friendship and its relation to kingship; again, this derives from earlier discussions. Here, it completes the exploration of the king as a problematic unequal presence in the city.⁶² Aristotle draws on Xenophon's and Herodotus' presentation of the role of the king's friends.⁶³ For Herodotus, friendship is a form of political strength, but also creates dependency and weakness; Darius' decision to grant guaranteed access to his co-conspirators later weakens his rule (3.84.2–3). Aristotle shows that monarchs use their friends and supporters to provide additional eyes and ears (3.16.1287b29–30), a procedure which undermines any claim to act entirely individually as a sole ruler.⁶⁴ The king transforms himself into a composite being, just as the deliberating citizens do (3.11.1281b5–7).

Aristotle's own analysis of friendship in political contexts, in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, permits only a limited form of friendship between incommensurable individuals (*EN* 8.7.1158b29–1159a12). King and subject must necessarily be incommensurable under a monarchical constitution, which is itself justified by the incommensurable excellence of the monarch. The friendship between them must be limited to euergetism, an important component of kingly virtue, but not as robust as friendship between equals. The nature of the inequality between kings and subjects restricts the kind of friendship Aristotle allows them: 'will those of much lesser resources be considered worthy friends for them?' (καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων· οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτοις ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναι φίλοι οἱ πολλοὶ καταδέεσθαι; 1159a1–2). The precept that it is friends who have community (*EN* 8.9.1159b31) will cause problems for the king within the community of the polis.⁶⁵

The impossibility of friendship for tyrants was a topos of Greek thought, central to Xenophon's Hiero the tyrant (*Hiero* 3.1–6, 5.1–2, 6.2–3). But Aristotle seems to extend the problem of friendship between the unequal to good forms of kingship as well. The ruler's need for friends undermines his singularity; he is no longer the solitary advance piece on the board, as in the primitive city (1.2.1253a6). If he has friends, they must be his political or natural equals, and thus undermine his claim to his unique status (1287b33). If he has friends, he has some form of equality or commensurability with them, and so his claim to kingship fails; the friends whom he uses and incorporates into his composite being must enjoy friendship of the most limited type, that created by the types of act of beneficence with which Cyrus ensnared his supporters.

The *pambasileus* in the political imaginary

After these arguments against monarchy, Aristotle counters with arguments which connect his earlier description of the man of outstanding virtue with the idea of kingship.⁶⁶ These arguments address the contemporary model of virtue monarchy and show how the virtue monarch can be incorporated into the polis, although

they continue to draw on examples, such as Deioeces and Theseus, deployed by other authors.⁶⁷

Aristotle hints at an original position in which the rational choice for citizens is to choose to be ruled by the man of outstanding virtue, rather than to insist that they themselves rule and are ruled in turn (3.17.1288a15–19). This requires the presence of an individual or family whose virtue is incommensurable with that of the other citizens.⁶⁸ The entire framing of this argument suggests that it is not a situation that Aristotle expects to arise in the present. Where this situation does occur is in political foundation narratives, in imaginary settings that explore the aboriginal and primitive past, responses to the possibility of something resembling a Hobbesian state of nature. Thus, while the political excellence of Herodotus' Deioeces seems distinct from fourth-century character virtues, Isocrates in his *Helen* provides the story of Theseus, a unifying monarch, told as that of an exemplar of character virtue. This account of Theseus' kingship, pre-dating Aristotle's *Politics* by several decades, creates a picture of the kind of virtue monarchy that Vander Waerdt and Newell wish to find in Aristotle; Xenophon's Cyrus also does so, though in a more complicated way.⁶⁹ For Isocrates, Theseus' monarchy is the result of the virtue of the individual and his individual choices, rather than the instantiation of cosmic order through an individual.

Aristotle attempts to deal with both accounts of monarchy, cosmic and virtue, perhaps because they are fused in the figure of Xenophon's Cyrus, although his overall focus is more on the consequences of the status gap between king and subjects and its consequences for the polis, than on its precise causes. The peculiar mereological properties of the *pambasileus* are emphasised; in Barker's translation, 'A whole is never intended by nature to be inferior to a part; and a man so greatly superior to others stands to them in the relation of a whole to its parts' (3.17.1288a26–28).⁷⁰ The *pambasileus*, as a whole, should be set over the collectivity of the citizens as parts. His authority should not be limited through such rule divided into temporal 'parts' (κατὰ μέρος) but exercised without such limits ('in an undivided way', ἀπλῶς, 3.17.1288a29).

Aristotle closes his chapter by returning to the problem of banishing the man of outstanding qualities (1288a24–6), explored more fully at 3.13.1284a26–30, using Herodotus' example of Periander's warning to Thrasyboulus (Hdt. 5.92), which conveniently expresses inequality between individual merit in terms of relative height of stalks of grain.⁷¹ This problem had also surfaced in later treatments of Theseus, in which his unification of the city angers Athens' wealthy and poor alike, and his euergetism is not enough to secure his rule (Plutarch *Theseus* 32.1–2).⁷² Aristotle's arguments are based on an appeal to these examples not so much as historical data but rather as elements in the Athenian political imaginary.

However, the criterion of possession of virtue (and perhaps this would apply to any other single quality, as outlined at 3.13.1284a3–10) seems to create something of a trap in Aristotle's account. If the candidate *pambasileus* or extremely virtuous man (and we should not assume their identity) is distinct from the other citizens by virtue of his possession of a greater amount or degree of the value chosen as a criterion, as discussed in 3.13, he is not sufficiently distinct to be incommensurable

and thus falls within the scope of the political distribution of participation within the city. If his distinctiveness lies in the possession of a quality that cannot be compared (3.13.1284a5–6), being of a different kind rather than of a different quantity, that qualifies him for *pambasileia*, but also problematises his relationship with the city, because his inequality is not one of degree, but one of fundamental difference, such as that from god to man or beast, like the *apolis* man (1.2.1253a1–29). The ostracised citizen possesses disproportionate qualities of the same characteristics as his fellow citizens, rather than distinctively super- or sub-human qualities of a different kind. Nonetheless, he is still made to leave the city in the interests of political order and the just distribution of political goods.

Quite what it takes for virtue to be possessed in a way that is 'incommensurable' (μὴ συμβλητήν), or what form the *politikē dunamis* that equates to this virtue takes (3.13.1284a5–6), is left open (and Aristotle does not think that there is necessarily just one such possible quality, 1288a23–4; different qualities might apply under different constitutions, for example). If it is of the same kind, there will be comparability through geometric equality; it is only if it is different in kind that incommensurability is guaranteed to arise. If this is the case, we resurrect the shepherd king and return to traditional monarchy: both Newell's and Vander Waerdt's analyses fall straight into this trap. Vander Waerdt goes so far as to argue that the virtuous ruler/king rules precisely through his possession of a different kind of virtue from that of the citizens. His 'heroic virtue' is superior in kind to the civic and philosophical virtue that the citizens are aiming at.⁷³ In Vander Waerdt's model, the citizens are able to develop their virtue and achieve the *telos* of *eudaimonia* through the leisure afforded to them and protected by the rule of the *pambasileus*; he in turn, because he is aiming for a different kind of virtue achieved through ruling, does not lose anything as a result of being unable to attain philosophical virtue. Riesbeck, on the other hand, notes that Aristotle's judgement is comparative; he suggests that Aristotle accepts that the summation principle might easily be outweighed by the excellence of one man in some primitive societies (as the world of epic might be taken to represent).⁷⁴ Riesbeck's paradox depends on any possible incommensurability depending on qualities which are either impossible to envisage or irrelevant to life in the polis. But this denies the distinctiveness of the kingly art identified by Plato in the *Statesman* and presented through case studies by Xenophon and Isocrates.⁷⁵ As a superordinate skill, the kingly art and its associated excellence are incommensurable with the skills and excellence of other arts and their possessors.

Aristotle's willingness to counter distinct statuses for different humans might provide some backing to such readings of the virtue arguments. The problem is that Aristotle himself does not even here generate a model that permits individuals of radically different kinds to interact within the city, unless they are considered equal *qua* citizens, in which case geometric equality enables their inequalities to be addressed at a practical level. He is best interpreted as exploring whether the metaphysical difficulties of cosmic or divine monarchy still pertain to the virtue monarchy developed by Isocrates and others, rather than whole-heartedly supporting it himself.

The distinctive status of heroic kings provides a comparison to that of the *pambasileus*. This is the type of kingship identified by Aristotle that is closest to *pambasileia*. Special status for kings does not worry writers of epic. Their kings are typically identified by non-human attributes that link them to divinity. Homeric epithets tag them as *dios*, *diotrephes*, and so on.⁷⁶ These are not the attributes of ordinary people, but of special individuals with a distinctive position in the cosmic order, mediating between human and divine, establishing good order in the cosmos, as Odysseus describes (*Od.* 19.109–14).⁷⁷ The surplus of meaning of kingship is happily accommodated in the heroic world, and the cultural status of epic reproduces and maintains this surplus meaning. But bearers of these qualities in the poetic imaginary worlds of epic and drama are acceptable in a way that a living, breathing example would not be within the very different world of the polis.

In requiring the *pambasileus* to act differently from other humans and not to seek the fulfilment of human desires and goals, those who advocate that the *pambasileus* be the bearer of a non-human form of virtue open up the problem of allotting a distinct ontological status to the ruler. That this is a difficulty for cosmic kingship models is recognised in Herodotus' story of the Egyptian king Amasis and the transformed gold basin (*Hdt.* 2.172–3, *Pol.* 1.12.1259b8–9).⁷⁸ Amasis wishes both that his innate distinction be recognised, and that he be able to set it aside when it suits him, although this leads to dissatisfaction among his subjects.

Of course Aristotle, unlike Hobbes, is not committed to the fundamental equality of humans, and could happily accept this distinction within the human world.⁷⁹ The prospect of a special status for the *pambasileus* should be considered alongside Aristotle's other arguments which allot a distinct status to individuals or groups, such as the natural slavery argument or his assessment of the distinctive roles and capabilities of women. The natural slave lacks the human capacity of reason to such an extent that he loses some of the social goods allotted to humans, and specifically can achieve virtue only through the agency of others (*Politics* 1.6.1254b16–27, 1.13.1259b32–1260a4). Women possess reason but of a distinctly second-rate kind (*Politics* 1.13.1260a9–14). In the cases of both slaves and women, the question becomes whether either their natures or their qualities are of the same kind, assessed against the assumed norm of the male citizen, but merely possessed in different quantities, or of a different kind, so that quantity is irrelevant.⁸⁰ These distinctions are important in Aristotle's assessment of the part-whole relationship of the household and its constituents.

Conclusion

Aristotle's exploration of kingship in *Politics* 3.13–18 represents a critical response to the virtue-kingship theories of Isocrates and Xenophon, parallel to that of Plato in the *Statesman* and the *Laws*. Aristotle draws on the existing Greek discourse of kingship, in which kings perform cosmic processes of political ordering and unification, connecting them to the divine, in order to explore the metaphysical problems that would arise from incorporating a king of incommensurable virtue within a city of equal citizens. He thus links this section to his earlier mereological

concerns about the parts and whole of the city. Aristotle's concern with kingship is therefore more abstract than many commentators on these chapters have observed, providing a thought-experiment that is somewhat separate from the political processes of the Athens-like Greek polis that is the concern of the earlier part of *Politics* III, although important for understanding how those processes are structured.

Both Plato and Aristotle include responses to the theory of virtue monarchy within political theories that emphasise the role of the citizen rather than the ruler in politics and the rule of law rather than of individuals as guarantor of access to the good life and a just existence within the context of the polis.

Aristotle, on the other hand, recognises that kingship is a complex phenomenon that goes beyond the limited forms for which he can identify historical examples. He takes the contemporary concept of virtue monarchy and places it in a new theoretical context. Taking the citizen, striving for a share in rule and just and equitable distribution of goods within the city, as his starting point, he shows that groups of equal citizens can develop the same capacities (of knowledge and analysis) as those attributed to monarchs in both cosmic and virtue models, turning themselves into a composite but single entity through deliberating together and amassing all their virtue. In this model the most difficult decision for such a composite political body to take would be to surrender decision-making powers to an extraordinary individual. The lack of historical examples of such a decision renders historicising readings of the account of *pambasileia* problematic, but Aristotle's theoretical sources contain political myths describing such an outcome; the thought-experiment has already been run by Herodotus (Deioces), Isocrates (Theseus) and Xenophon (Cyrus), and persists in political myth.

Rather than look to history or contemporary events for candidate absolute monarchs, readers of the *Politics* should look to the myths which embedded such monarchs in the political imaginary of cities such as Athens. The responses to Plato's thought on kingship and reassertion of the figure of the shepherd king show the continuing power of the idea of kingship.

Notes

- 1 See Cherry 2012 and Buekenhout 2016.
- 2 Schofield 2012: 285–301.
- 3 Riesbeck 2016.
- 4 The question of whether a king can be contained within the structure of the classical polis has been re-opened by Riesbeck, who argues that this is the case (2016: 17–19, 236–8).
- 5 Historicist Macedonian readings: Bosworth 1996; Ehrenberg 1938; Kelsen 1937. More recent interpretations: Gastaldi 2009; Kahn 1990; Laurand 2011; Nagle 2000: 127–9; Ober 1998: 343–4. Carlier 1993 provides a careful historical reading arguing against identifying Macedonian monarchy and the *pambasileus*. However, there is a tradition of other work by Aristotle on kingship, such as a short treatise *On Kingship*, identified as addressed to Alexander and exhorting him to virtue (Rose Fr. 647, with testimony in Cic. *Att.* 12.40.2, 13.28.2).
- 6 Aristotle uses Jason of Phrae (*Pol.* 3.4.1277a24) as an example of the distinction between tyranny and private life. See Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.4–19, 6.4.20–32 for an account of his career and assassination.

- 7 For example, fourth-century rulers used as exemplars by Isocrates include Archidamus of Sparta and Nicocles of Salamis as speakers, and Jason of Pherae (*To Philip* 119–20), Dionysius of Sicily (*Nicocles* 23, *Philip* 65, *Archidamus* 44), Amyntas of Macedon (*Archidamus* 46, *Philip* 106), and Cyrus the Great of Persia (*Philip* 66, 132, *Evagoras* 37–8), but Philip of Macedon assumes a central importance in his later work.
- 8 Nagle 2000: 118–19; Newell 1987; Vander Waerdt 1985.
- 9 Gastaldi 2009 emphasises the structural significance of the monarchy chapters to Aristotle's political thought as a whole, a point reiterated by Riesbeck 2016: 8–10, 17–30.
- 10 Bosworth 1996: 105–7; Christodoulou 2009: 300–17 link Aristotle's thought on kingship to Alexander's claimed divinity, but this is an unwarranted inference.
- 11 Nagle (2000: 118–19) incorporates both readings by separating virtuous man and king.
- 12 Newman (1887: 3.279) suggests that in referring to 'the rule called *pambasileia*' (τῆς παμβασιλείας καλουμένης, 3.16.1287a8) Aristotle is noting earlier usage of the term.
- 13 Alc. Fr. 2 (Diehl); Ar. *Nub.* 357, 1150. The Alcaeus fragment addresses a king, describing him as the *pambasileus* (παμβασιλῆϊ) son of Cronus.
- 14 Bowie 1993: 112–30. Bowie notes Adeimantus' critique of Orphic texts and their reception within *poies* at *Rep.* 2.364e3–365a3. Carlier notes the divine overtones in Aristotle's secular use of the word (Carlier 1993: 108–9). That *pambasileia* is used to address a range of goddesses in the Orphic Hymns, usually taken to be late Hellenistic works, confirms this; Rhea (14.7), Semele (44.1), Hera (16.2), Hygieia (68.1), Physis (10.16, cf. line 1, ('Physis, goddess and mother to all', ὦ Φύσι, παμμήτειρα θεά) are all addressed as such. The earth itself is all-queenly (χθόνα παμβασιλείαν, 11.2, 18.6) in addresses to Pan and Pluto. The masculine noun *pambasileus* was later used by the church fathers as a way to address their god.
- 15 Bowie 1993: 102–33.
- 16 Cf. Hesiod's Pandora, endowed with gifts from all the gods (Hes. *Op.* 53–82), and Aphrodite Pandemos, the earthly, lower form of love (Pl. *Smp.* 181a7–c2).
- 17 Lane 1997: 75 notes the *Statesman*'s distinction between great and small, and the interest in proportionality developed in the dialogue, cf. 'complete-sized' (παμμέγεθες, *Prm.* 164d4). See also Cherry 2012: 118–21.
- 18 Gigante 1956: 150–3. See Chapter 1.
- 19 See Introduction, n.48.
- 20 Newman 1887: 3.279 notes the related παμμήτωρ = πάντων μήτηρ ('mother of all', (A. *Pr.* 9; also an epithet of Rhea in an Orphic Hymn) by which example *pambasileus* would be 'king of all', πάντων βασιλεύς. At *Rhet.* 1.7.1365b37–1366a1 Aristotle defines *monarchia*: 'monarchy is, according to its name, the constitution in which one man is sovereign over all (εἰς ἀπάντων κύριός ἐστιν); those which are subject to order (κατὰ τάξιν) are kingship (βασίλεια), those without limit tyranny (ἄοριστος τυραννίς)'.
 21 Both Barker and Jowett translate πάντων as 'all things/matters' (Everson 1988; Stalley 1995).
- 22 Cf. Sophocles *OC* 1040–41, in which Theseus promises to restore Oedipus as *kurios* over the kidnapped Antigone and Ismene; see Chapter 2.
- 23 Many have argued that *Politics* I responds to Plato's argument (*Plt.* 259d) that rule over city and rule over the household are the same; see Cherry 2012: 29–31; El Murr 2014: 103–8; Natali 1979–80; Schofield 1990.
- 24 Cf. Halper 2009: 1–7, 20–3. Halper regards part-whole concerns as central to Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, so would presumably see a closer link between that work and the *Politics*.
- 25 Mayhew 1997; Trott 2013: 42–82. Adriel Trott argues for the naturalness of the polis in a strong, organic sense; while her conclusion that the polis community 'is natural because it arises from within itself . . . to achieve its end', human flourishing (81), stretches the idea of a natural organism, her approach is helpful for exploring Aristotle's political mereology.
- 26 Hobbes 1996: 9, 120, Chapter 17.
- 27 Mayhew 2008: 83–9, Pl. *Leg.* 10.889d6–e1.

- 28 Cf. the Pythagorean table of opposites (*Met.* A.5.986a24–27), and the priority of circle and sphere, *De Caelo* 2.4.286b10–25, especially 16–18; this in turn (286b33–287a2) may relate to Aristotle's critique of Hippodamus of Miletus and his use of triads (*Pol.* 2.8.1267b30–39). Aristotle's own *Metaphysics* is not foregrounded here, although Halper regards one–many relations as central to that work (Halper 2009: 1–7, 20–3). Kamp 1985: 296–301 grounds his reading of Aristotle's political thought in *Metaphysics* rather than the *Categories* (see Schütrumpf 1989). On the status of *endoxa* in Aristotle's thought see Frede 2012.
- 29 Cherry 2012: 183–90 contrasts the differing concerns of Alasdair MacIntyre (1985), Martha Nussbaum (2000) and Stephen Salkever (1990) in rejecting a metaphysical foundation to Aristotle's political thought.
- 30 Hobbes 1996: 462–8 (Ch. 46, 'Darknesse from Vain Philosophy', 371–6); see Skinner 1996: 396–8, 406–7. Early modern proponents of absolutism make much use of Aristotle: Bodin 1955 book 6; Filmer 1991: 159–61, Chapter 10.
- 31 MacIntyre 1985; Salkever 1990: 36–53. Salkever separates Aristotle's political thought from his metaphysics and cosmology (49) to escape conclusions he finds unacceptable, about differing but fixed statuses for humans.
- 32 Carlier 1993: 116 notes this view without naming its proponents.
- 33 Th. 2.37.1, Pl. *Prt.* 320d–328d. See Braun 1959; Cammack 2013; Lane 2013; Waldron 1995.
- 34 Herodotus comments that it was easier to deceive the Athenian multitude than the Spartan king (5.97.2, cf. 3.80–2), while Thucydides presents group deliberation leading the Athenian assembly to worse rather than better judgements (as with the Sicilian Expedition, 6.8–25, 8.1).
- 35 Mulgan 1974; Newell 1987.
- 36 Aristotle omits the punchline 'show us your claws and teeth'. The hares could, however, claim commensurability *qua* members of a political body rather than *qua* hares. Vander Waerdt 1985: 253–4.
- 37 *Pol.* 1.2.1253a2–7, a25–39. Mulgan 1974 opposes Braun 1959 on this, arguing that the difference in kind rules out the application of the summation argument. He cites Ross (1924: 427) on *Met.* 1080a19 to suggest that comparability requires the same kind (in this case, comparability of numbers). But this misses the degree to which Aristotle is problematising the possibility of a difference in kind between king and subject.
- 38 Following Bonitz, who suggests that '*kai* sometimes joins two words of the same meaning, and seems to have the sense more of explaining than joining', offering *Met.* Δ.14.1020b2–3, 'unchanging things, such as mathematical objects' (τὰ ἀκίνητα καὶ τὰ μαθηματικά), as an example in which the *kai* limits the extent of the first noun to the content of the second. (Bonitz 1955: 357).
- 39 For example the historical *politeiai* of book II are strongly refracted through previous literary depictions of them, such as Xenophon's *Lac. Pol.*
- 40 Different views on kingship in archaic Greece and its literature: Osborne 2009: 137–9, 43–4; Rose 2012: 180–94. Note that Aristotle does not regard the dual kingship of Sparta as significant in identifying it as a weaker form of kingship.
- 41 Pittacus appears in Herodotus 1.27.2 as a 'wise warner', and in Plato's *Protagoras* as a sage (343a2) and as the author of the tag 'it is difficult to be good' (343b7), critiqued by Simonides in Socrates' lengthy report (343b7–347a3), in which he imports the idea of virtue/nobility into a political context, and problematises the distinction between virtuous man and god. Aristotle's presentation of *aisumneteia* is far from historically accurate (Romer 1982).
- 42 E.g. 3.15.1268b8–22, a historical discussion of the evolution of kingship.
- 43 Gastaldi 2009; Nagle 2000: 124. Nagle argues that the introduction here presents the *pambasileus* as a historical figure, but that the subsequent discussion (3.15–17) examines a theoretical figure.

- 44 In addition to the relation between one and all expressed here, *kurios* has some work to do. It connotes legal authority in both the household and the political system, with the noun more explicitly referring to the household. Plato uses the superlative form (κυριώτατον) to refer to political rule. *Pl. Rep.* 8.565a2–3: ὁ δὴ πλεῖστόν τε καὶ κυριώτατον ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ ὅτανπερ ἄθροισθῇ. *Kurios* also describes the status of the Athenian assembly, as in *Ar. Ach.* 19, 'when the assembly is sovereign', οὐσης κυρίας ἐκκλησίας (cf. Hansen 1999: 299–303). Although the adjective features extensively in the *Laws*, it does not appear in the *Statesman*.
- 45 Such features may result from editorial reorganisation of the text.
- 46 Hicks and Susemihl 1894: 84–7.
- 47 Robinson 1995: 56.
- 48 Carlier 1993.
- 49 *Pol.* 1.1.1252a7–17 and *Pl. Plt.* 259d4–5.
- 50 Xenophon's exploration of Cyrus' new status after the conquest of Babylon, when he begins to present himself as an absolute monarch, provides a further example of a ruler transcending law in the process of personifying it; Cyrus becomes the 'seeing law' (*Xen. Cyr.* 8.1.22); see Chapter 5.
- 51 Aristotle examined the problems of changing existing laws and introducing new ones in his assessment of Hippodamus of Miletus (2.8.1268b22–1269a28); he disputes the analogy between law and craft both there and at 3.16.1287a32–b8.
- 52 Aristotle disparages Lycurgus for failing to incorporate Spartan women into his law-code effectively (2.9.1270a6–8) and for simply copying the earlier Cretan law-code (2.10.1271b24–27). But Lycurgus' role is also minimised in Plato's *Laws*, where he is one of three saviours of the Spartan constitution, albeit one described as 'some god taking care of you' (θεὸς εἶναι κηδόμενος ὑμῶν τις, *Laws* 3.691d8–e1).
- 53 Cf. the question of the interrelatedness or otherwise of the goodness of an individual who inhabits both identities. The possible limitation of the extent of the multitude generating collective wisdom to an oligarchic few poses a problem for strictly summative interpretations of the argument (such as Cammack 2013). Melissa Lane has suggested a more limited collectivity, more like a Spartan mess to which members bring their hunting catches as additional fare, than the large-scale Athenian tribal feasts to which Aristotle's phrase 'feast to which many contribute' (ἐστίασις συμφορητός, a29) is usually linked (as a formal liturgy imposed on the wealthy); Lane 2013: 254–6.
- 54 Newman 1887 *ad* 1287b1 sees this as a reference to *Hdt.* 3.82.3.
- 55 Though *Laws* 4.713e2 presents being *astasiastos* as a form of life available only in the golden age under the rule of the shepherd king, which the rule of law must attempt to imitate.
- 56 3.16.1287a8–12, b35–36. That Aristotle reports anti-monarchists' concern about the one man sovereign over all (1287a11) suggests that these objections connect to his own concerns. One can also see links with the *Laws* and its worries about the lack of individual incorruptibility.
- 57 This is one of several points where the distinction between heroic monarchy and *pambasileia* looks somewhat overstated; the decline of heroic monarchy (3.14.1285b3–13) follows a similar pattern.
- 58 This dependence on other texts rather than observation as the basis of enquiry distinguishes Aristotle's social science from his natural science.
- 59 See Chapter 1.
- 60 See Chapter 6.
- 61 Cf. Xenophon *Hiero* 2.9–11, 10.2–4.
- 62 *EN* 8.7.1158b36–1159a6.
- 63 See above: *Hdt.* 1.100.2; *Xen. Cyr.* 8.2.13–14.
- 64 Deioces needed to exclude the friends who might have realised that he is no better than them (*Herodotus* 1.99.2); Amasis' friends berated him for being insufficiently regal

- (2.173.2). Cyrus too uses his friends, bound to him by his generosity, as extra organs of perception (*Cyr.* 8.2.10–11).
- 65 Cf. *Laws* 3.695d2–3, 3.697c9–d1, where good rule brings friendship and community, extreme rule destroys it.
- 66 Newell and Vander Waerdt both conclude that this part of the *Politics* argues against modern commentators who position Aristotle as a proponent of the practical wisdom of the many as opposed to the science of the few (Newell 1987: 175–6; Vander Waerdt 1985: 272–3).
- 67 Herodotus 1.96–102, Isocrates *Helen*; see Chapters 1 and 3.
- 68 At no point in this discussion is the specific excellence required defined, but it surely carries over the *politikē dunamis* from 3.13.
- 69 See Chapters 3 and 5.
- 70 Jowett has 'The whole is naturally superior to the part, and he who has this pre-eminence is in the relation of a whole to a part'.
- 71 Although Aristotle presents this as a historical example, Herodotus (5.92) wraps it in the Corinthian Socles' speech to the Spartans against tyranny, thus emphasising its status as discourse.
- 72 See Chapter 3.
- 73 Vander Waerdt 1985: 264–5, conceding that this Thomist reading pushes far beyond anything Aristotle himself says.
- 74 Riesbeck 2016: 259–61.
- 75 Riesbeck 2016: 263 n.43. The art embodies a distinctive kind of knowledge, not a general form, and so Riesbeck's objection fails.
- 76 *Il.* 1.121 ('divine', δῖος), 489 ('god-born', διογενής), 176, 2.98, 196, 4.63 ('god-reared kings', διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων), *Od.* 4.156, 236, etc ('god-reared Menelaus, son of Atreus', Ἀτρεΐδῃ Μενέλαε διοτρεφές).
- 77 Hes. *Th.* 81–92. See Introduction.
- 78 See Chapter 1; Benardete 1969: 66–7 explores these stories as attempts to link 'the high and noble . . . and the base and mean'.
- 79 Hobbes 1996: 107, with his 'ninth Law of Nature . . . *That every man acknowledge other for his Equall by Nature*'.
- 80 Cf. Neo-Aristotelian arguments, such as Nussbaum's capabilities argument, which bracket Aristotle's hierarchical account of human statuses: Nussbaum 1990.

Conclusion

The imaginary king and the metaphysics of political unity

Despite Plato and Aristotle's efforts to dismantle its foundations, the model of virtue monarchy developed by Isocrates and Xenophon would be taken up in the Hellenistic period, and gain renewed contact with the non-Greek cultures from which it drew.¹ The structures of the Hellenistic kingdoms meant that there was no longer a problem of incorporating the king into the internal structures of the polis, but rather that monarchical rule was super-imposed over the existing internal arrangements of Greek cities. Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* model, with its multilayered mixed form of kingship, exemplified by the imperial Cyrus' relationship with Persia that retained its distinctive political culture, would prevail.

The fifth-century discourse of kingship had two main focuses, the comparative investigation of monarchy as a source of both political stability and precarity, and the ideological use of kings and their stories within the political imaginary. These were expressed through both drama and historiography. Keeping comparative perspectives such as those of Herodotus and Aeschylus in mind is beneficial for understanding the broader scope of Greek political thought, ranging far beyond the limits of the contemporary polis itself.

During the fourth century BCE there was a change in the Athenian discourse of kingship from the earlier symbolic representation, in which the king as a character of tragedy represented an ideal of the collective citizens, to exemplarity, in which the king as an exemplum of political theory represented a *paradeigma* that the citizens needed to imitate to achieve a lesser instance of the qualities exhibited by the kingly figure. In Plato's version, the ideal constitution of the expert king was imitated to greater or lesser extent by existing constitutions, with the best of these also called kingship (though by analogy). For virtue theorists, generating a distinction in excellence between the model king and political subjects created a limit to the quality of subjects' imitation of their ruler's virtue. In some cases, as with Xenophon's Cyrus, those for whom the gap was greatest reacted to their ruler with *thauma* rather than copying him through *mimesis*, as his close associates did.

Developments of Plato's thought, seen in the late short dialogues attributed to him such as the *Alcibiades* and *Minos*, emphasise the stability of kingly rule compared with the alternatives, especially tyranny. But the discourse of kingship is more than the negation of the discourse of tyranny; kingship generates something more than the absence of bad rule. Participants in the discourse developed models

in which they sought to identify the property or quality that enabled both ruler and ruled to accept the distinction in status accorded to the ruler, while simultaneously resting their arguments on the surplus meaning accorded to kingship by its traditional link with processes of cosmic ordering. The unique function ascribed to kings, that of being agents of structural change within the polis, created an ontological distinction between kings and their subjects. While the discourse of kingship fits with Axial Age models in which new conceptions of authority are developed, it shows that the grounds for granting authority to kings were contested and subject to debate.

A secondary task then arose, the development of a way to describe the relationship between this distinctive figure and the structure of the democratic polis, where its presence was at odds with the ideology of citizen equality. Those possessing this quality were separated by time into history and by temporality into myth, their special status benefitting the city without necessitating the concrete physical presence of a ruler. The power of kings, even those conjured solely from myth, was exercised from within the political imaginary, contested across literary and visual and instantiated within the city through its performance culture.

While the discourse of kingship first arose in early epic poetry, it took on a distinctive form when incorporated into the ideology of the polis and particularly the strongly egalitarian ideology of the democratic polis. The myths of Theseus' unification of the city remained a potent symbol of civic unity, and the figure of the democratic king represented the shared qualities of the citizen body as collective actor. But this democratic repurposing of the symbolic power of kingship was eventually undermined by the transformation of foundation myths into more historical forms, providing the materials for new political models based on appeals to a historicised if not historical past. The founder king became an exemplary possessor of character virtues sufficient to endow him with the authority to rule over fellow citizens, even if no such exemplars could be found in the present.

Note

- 1 Haake 2007; Murray 2007.

Bibliography

- Adam, J. (1963) [1905] *The Republic of Plato*, ed. D.A. Rees, 2 vols. (2nd edn.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Adorno, T.W. and Horkheimer, M. (1986) [1944] *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. J. Cumming (London: Verso).
- Ahrendorf, P.J. (2009) *Greek Tragedy and Political Philosophy: Rationalism and Religion in Sophocles' Theban Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Alexanderson, B. (1967) 'Darius in the *Persians*', *Eranos*, 65, 1–11.
- Alexiou, E. (2007) 'Rhetorik, Philosophie und Politik: Isokrates und die *homologoumene arete*', *Rhetorica*, 25 (1), 1–13.
- . (2009) 'Das Proömium des isokratischen "Euagoras" und die Epitaphienreden', *WJA*, 33, 31–52.
- . (2010) *Der Euagoras des Isokrates: ein Kommentar* (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Allan, L. (2005) 'Le Roi Imaginaire: An Audience with the Achaemenid King', in O.J. Hekster and R. Fowler (eds.), 39–62.
- Allan, W. (2006) 'Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic', *JHS*, 126, 1–35.
- Allen, D.S. (2000) 'Changing the Authoritative Voice: Lycurgus *Against Leocrates*', *ClAnt*, 19 (1), 5–33.
- . (2006) 'Talking About Revolution: On Political Change in Fourth-Century Athens and Historiographic Method', in S.D. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Rethinking Revolutions Through Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 183–217.
- . (2016) 'Donald Trump Is a Walking, Talking Example of the Tyrannical Soul', *Washington Post*, Post Partisan blog. <www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2016/10/08/donald-trump-is-a-walking-talking-example-of-the-tyrannical-soul/>, accessed 23/4/2017.
- Anderson, C.A. and Dix, T.K. (2006) 'Prometheus and the Basileia in Aristophanes' *Birds*', *CJ*, 102 (4), 321–7.
- Annas, J. (1982) 'Plato's Myths of Judgement', *Phronesis*, 27 (2), 119–43.
- Arends, F. (1999) 'The Long March to Plato's *Statesman*', *Polis*, 16 (1–2), 93–125.
- Asheri, D. (2003) *Erodoto Libro VIII, La vittoria de Temistocle* (Rome: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla).
- . (2007a) 'Book I', in D. Asheri, A.B. Lloyd, and A. Corcella (eds.), *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 57–218.
- . (2007b) 'Book III', in D. Asheri, A.B. Lloyd, and A. Corcella (eds.), *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 379–527.
- Atack, C. (2010) 'Ancestral Constitutions in Fourth-Century BCE Athenian Political Argument: Genre and Re-invention', MPhil dissertation (University of Cambridge).

- . (2018a) “‘Cyrus Appeared Both Great and Good’: Xenophon and the Performativity of Kingship”, in P. Christesen, D.S. Allen, and P. Millett (eds.), *How To Do Things With History: New Approaches to Ancient Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 109–35.
- . (2018b) ‘Plato’s *Statesman* and Xenophon’s *Cyrus*’, in G. Danzig, D.M. Johnson, and D. Morrison (eds.), *Plato and Xenophon: Comparative Studies* (Mnemosyne Supplements; Leiden: Brill), 510–43.
- . (2018c) ‘Imagined Superpowers: Isocrates’ Opposition of Athens and Sparta’, in P. Cartledge and A. Powell (eds.), *The Greek Superpower: Sparta in the Self-Definitions of Athenians* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales), 157–84.
- . (2018d) ‘*Politeia* and the Past in Xenophon and Isocrates’, *Trends in Classics*, 10 (1), 171–94.
- Ausland, H.W. (2000) ‘The *Euthydemus* and the Dating of Plato’s Dialogues’, in L. Brisson and T.M. Robinson (eds.), *Plato: Euthydemus, Lysis, Charmides. Proceedings of the V Symposium Platonicum* (Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag), 20–6.
- Avery, H.C. (1964) ‘Dramatic Devices in Aeschylus’ *Persians*’, *AJPhil*, 85 (2), 173–84.
- Azoulay, V. (2004) *Xénophon et les Grâces du Pouvoir: De la Charis au Charisme* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne).
- . (2006) ‘Isocrate, Xénophon ou Le Politique Transfiguré’, *REA*, 108, 133–53.
- . (2007) ‘Panthée, Mania et quelques autres: les jeux du genre dans l’oeuvre de Xénophon’, in V. Sebillotte Cuchet and N. Ernoult (eds.), *Problèmes du genre en Grèce ancienne* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne), 277–87.
- . (2009) ‘Lycurque d’Athènes et le passé de la cité: entre neutralisation et instrumentalisation’, *Cahiers des Études Anciennes*, 46, 149–80.
- . (2011) ‘Les Métamorphoses du *koinon* athénien: autour du Contre Léocrate de Lycurque’, in V. Azoulay and P. Ismard (eds.), 191–217.
- Azoulay, V. and Ismard, P. (eds.) (2011) *Clisthène et Lycurque d’Athènes: autour du politique dans la cité classique* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne).
- Bakola, E. (2010) *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Balot, R.K. (2014) *Courage in the Democratic Polis: Ideology and Critique in Classical Athens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Barber, B.J. (1996) ‘Misreading Democracy: Peter Euben and the *Gorgias*’, in J. Ober and C.W. Hedrick (eds.), *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 361–75.
- Barjamovic, G. (2012) ‘Propaganda and Practice in Assyrian and Persian Imperial Culture’, in P.F. Bang and D. Kolodziejczyk (eds.), *Universal Empire: A Comparative Approach to Imperial Culture and Representation in Eurasian History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 43–59.
- Bellah, R.N. and Joas, H. (eds.) (2012) *The Axial Age and Its Consequences* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press).
- Belloni, L. (1994) *I Persiani* (Milano: Vita e pensiero).
- Benardete, S. (1969) *Herodotean Inquiries* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).
- Berneke, R. (2004) *Dramaturgie und Ideologie: der politische Mythos in den Hikesiedramen des Aischylos, Sophokles und Euripides* (München: K.G. Saur).
- Betegh, G. (2010) ‘What Makes a Myth *eikôs*? Remarks Inspired by Myles Burnyeat’s *EIKÔS MYTHOS*’, in R.D. Mohr and B.M. Sattler (eds.), 213–24.
- Bichler, R. (1995) *Von der Insel der Seligen zu Platons Staat: Geschichte der antiken Utopie* (Wien: Böhlau).

- . (2000) *Herodots Welt: der Aufbau der Historie am Bild der fremden Länder und Völker, ihrer Zivilisation und ihrer Geschichte* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).
- Biles, Z.P. and Olson, S.D. (2015) *Aristophanes: Wasps* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Bizos, M. (1971) *Cyropédie: Livres I & II* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Blamire, A. (1989) *Plutarch: Life of Kimon* (London: Institute of Classical Studies).
- Blank, T.G.M. (2013) 'Isocrates on Paradoxical Discourse: An Analysis of *Helen* and *Busiris*', *Rhetorica*, 31 (1), 1–33.
- Blondell, R. (2005) 'From Fleece to Fabric: Weaving Culture in Plato's *Statesman*', *OSAPh*, 28, 23–75.
- Bloom, A.D. (1955) 'The Political Philosophy of Isocrates', PhD Dissertation (University of Chicago).
- Blumenberg, H. (1985) *Work on Myth*, trans. R.M. Wallace (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Blundell, M.W. (1991) *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (1993) 'The ideal of Athens in *Oedipus at Colonus*', in A.H. Sommerstein et al. (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis* (Bari: Levante), 287–306.
- Bodin, J. (1955) *Six Books of the Commonwealth*, trans. M.J. Tooley (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Bolin, T.M. (1999) 'History, Historiography and the Use of the Past in the Hebrew Bible', in C.S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Mnemosyne; Leiden: Brill), 113–40.
- Bonitz, H. (1955) *Index Aristotelicus*, eds. J. Bona Meyer and B.A. Langkavel (2nd edn.; Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt).
- Bordes, J. (1982) *Politeia dans la Pensée Grecque jusqu'à Aristote* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Börm, H. (2015) 'Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity: A Very Short Introduction', in H. Börm and W. Havener (eds.), *Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity* (Stuttgart: Steiner), 9–24.
- Bosher, K. (2012) 'Hieron's Aeschylus', in K. Bosher (ed.), *Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 97–111.
- Bosworth, A.B. (1996) *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Bottici, C. (2007) *A Philosophy of Political Myth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Bouchet, C. (2014) *Isocrate l'Athénien, ou, La belle hégémonie: étude des relations internationales au IV^e siècle a.c* (Bordeaux: Diffusion de Boccard).
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*, trans. J.B. Thompson (Cambridge: Polity).
- Bowden, H. (2013) 'On Kissing and Making Up: Court Protocol and Historiography in Alexander the Great's "Experiment With Proskynesis"', *BICS*, 56, 55–77.
- Bowen, A. (2013) *Aeschylus: Suppliant Women* (Oxford: Oxbow Books).
- Bowie, A.M. (1993) *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual and Comedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2000) 'Myth and Ritual in the Rivals of Aristophanes', in F.D. Harvey and J. Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales), 317–39.
- Bradeen, D.W. (1963) 'The Fifth-Century Archon List', *Hesperia*, 32 (2), 187–208.
- Brancacci, A. (1992) 'Struttura compositiva e fonti della terza orazione *Sulla regalità* di Dione Crisostomo: Dione e l'Archelao di Antistene', in W. Haase and H. Temporini

- (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (II, 36, 5) (Berlin: de Gruyter), 3308–34.
- . (2013) 'Introduzione al pensiero politico di Antistene', in F. de Luise and A. Stavru (eds.), *Socratica III* (Sankt Augustin: Academia), 29–40.
- Braun, E. (1959) 'Die Summierungstheorie des Aristoteles', *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts*, 44, 157–84.
- Breasted, J.H. (1906) *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents From the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest*, 5 vols. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Breebaart, A.B. (1983) 'From Victory to Peace: Some Aspects of Cyrus' State in Xenophon's *Cyrupaidia*', *Mnemosyne*, 36 (1/2), 117–34.
- Bremmer, J.N. (1997) 'Myth as Propaganda: Athens and Sparta', *ZPE*, 117, 9–17.
- Bringmann, K. (1965) *Studien Zu Den Politischen Ideen Des Isokrates* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Brisson, L. (1987) 'L'Égypte de Platon', *Études Philosophiques*, 2/3, 153–68.
- . (1995) 'Interprétation du mythe du Politique', in C.J. Rowe (ed.), *Reading the Statesman: Proceedings of the III Symposium Platonicum* (Sankt Augustin: Academia), 349–63.
- . (2016) 'Axial Breakthrough in Ancient Greece. New Considerations: Plato, Confucius, and the Buddha', *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9 (4), 555–64.
- Brisson, L. and Scolnicov, S. (eds.) (2003) *Plato's Laws: From Theory into Practice* (Sankt Augustin: Academia).
- Broadhead, H.D. (1960) *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Broadie, S. (2012) *Nature and Divinity in Plato's Timaeus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Brock, R. (2013) *Greek Political Imagery From Homer to Aristotle* (London: Bloomsbury).
- Brown, S.C. (1988) 'The *Médikos Logos* of Herodotus and the Evolution of the Median State', in A. Kuhrt and H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (eds.), *Method and Theory: Proceedings of the London 1985 Achaemenid History Workshop* (Achaemenid History; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten), 71–86.
- Buekenhout, B. (2016) 'Kingly Versus Political Rule in Aristotle's *Politics*', *Apeiron*, 49 (4), 515–37.
- Burian, P. (1974a) 'Suppliant and Saviour. *Oedipus at Colonus*', *Phoenix*, 28, 408–29.
- . (1974b) 'Pelagus and Politics in Aeschylus' Danaid Trilogy', *WS*, 8, 5–14.
- . (1977) 'Euripides' *Heraclidae*: An Interpretation', *CPh*, 72 (1), 1–21.
- . (1985) 'Logos and pathos: The Politics of the *Suppliant Women*', in P. Burian (ed.), *Directions in Euripidean Criticism: A Collection of Essays* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press), 129–55.
- . (2011) 'Athenian Tragedy as Democratic Discourse', in D.M. Carter (ed.), *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 95–117.
- Burnyeat, M.F. (2002) 'Plato on How Not to Speak of What Is Not: *Euthydemus* 283a–288a', in P. Pellegrin and M. Canto-Sperber (eds.), *Le Style de la Pensée: Recueil de textes en hommage à Jacques Brunschwig* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres), 40–66.
- . (2005) 'ΕΙΚΩΣ ΜΥΘΟΣ', *Rhizai*, 2 (2), 143–65; also Partenie (ed.) (2009), 167–86.
- Butler, J.P. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism And The Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge).

- Caizzi, F.D. (1966) *Antisthenes: Fragmenta* (Milano: Cisalpino).
- Calame, C. (1996) *Thésée et l'Imaginaire athénien: légende et culte en Grèce antique* (2nd edn; Lausanne: Editions Payot).
- . (1998) 'Mûthos, lógos et histoire: usages du passé héroïque dans la rhétorique grecque', *L'Homme*, 147, 127–49.
- . (2011) 'Myth and Performance on the Athenian Stage: Praxithea, Erechtheus, Their Daughters, and the Etiology of Autochthony', *CPh*, 106 (1), 1–19.
- Cammack, D. (2013) 'Aristotle on the Virtue of the Multitude', *Political Theory*, 41 (2), 175–202.
- Cannadine, D. (1983) 'The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the "Invention of Tradition", c. 1820–1977', in E.J. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 101–64.
- Canto-Sperber, M. (1989) *Platon: Euthydème* (Paris: Flammarion).
- Carlier, P. (1978) 'L'idée de monarchie impériale dans la *Cyropédie* de Xénophon', *Ktéma*, 3, 133–63.
- . (1984) *La Royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (Strasbourg: AECR).
- . (1993) 'La notion de *pambasileia* dans la pensée politique d'Aristote', in M. Piérart (ed.), *Aristote et Athènes = Aristoteles and Athens* (Fribourg: Séminaire d'Histoire ancienne de l'Université de Fribourg), 103–18.
- Carone, G.R. (2004) 'Reversing the Myth of the *Politicus*', *CQ*, 54 (1), 88–108.
- Carrière, J.-C. (1979) *Le Carnaval et la Politique. Une introduction à la comédie grecque* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- . (1997) 'Les métamorphoses des mythes et la crise de la cité dans la Comédie Ancienne', in P. Thiery and M. Menu (eds.), *Aristophane: la langue, la scène, la cité: actes du colloque de Toulouse 17–19 mars 1994* (Bari: Levante), 413–42.
- . (1998) 'Du mythe à l'histoire: généalogies héroïques, chronologies légendaires et historicisation des mythes', in D. Auger and S. Saïd (eds.), *Généalogies Mythiques* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres), 47–85.
- . (2004) 'Politique, éducation et pulsions *naturelles* dans les *Guêpes*: de la comédie sociale *réaliste* à la subversion comique *carnavalesque* et au triomphe de Dionysos', *Dioniso*, 3, 66–89.
- Carter, D.M. (ed.) (2011) *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Carter, L.B. (1986) *The Quiet Athenian* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Cartledge, P. (1987) *Agasilaos and the Crisis of Sparta* (London: Duckworth).
- . (1990) *Aristophanes and His Theatre of the Absurd* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press).
- . (1993) 'Xenophon's Women: A Touch of the Other', in H.D. Jocelyn and H. Hurt (eds.), *Tria Lustra* (Liverpool: Liverpool Classical Monthly), 5–14.
- . (2002a) *Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History, 1300–362 BC* (2nd edn.; London: Routledge).
- . (2002b) *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (2nd edn.; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- . (2009) *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Cassirer, E. (1946) *The Myth of the State* (London: Oxford University Press).
- Castoriadis, C. (1987) [1975] *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, trans. K. Blamey (Cambridge: Polity).

- . (1991) 'The Greek Polis and the Creation of Democracy', in D.A. Curtis (ed.), *Philosophy, Politics, Autonomy*, trans. D.A. Curtis (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 81–123.
- . (1997) 'The Greek and the Modern Political Imaginary', in *World in Fragments*, trans. D.A. Curtis (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press), 84–107.
- . (2002) [1999] *On Plato's Statesman*, trans. D.A. Curtis (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).
- . (2007) *Figures of the Thinkable* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).
- . (2008) *Ce qui Fait la Grèce 2: La cité et les lois*, eds E. Escobar, M. Gondicas, and P. Vernay (Paris: Seuil).
- Castriota, D. (1992) *Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press).
- Cavini, W. (1995) 'Naming and Argument: Diaeretic Logic in Plato's *Statesman*', in C.J. Rowe (ed.), *Reading the Statesman* (Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag), 123–38.
- Chance, T.A. (1992) *Plato's Euthydemus: Analysis of What Is and Is Not Philosophy* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- Chernyakhovskaya, O. (2014) *Sokrates bei Xenophon: Moral – Politik – Religion* (Tübingen: Narr).
- Cherry, K.M. (2012) *Plato, Aristotle, and the Purpose of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Christ, M.R. (1994) 'Herodotean Kings and Historical Inquiry', *CIAnt*, 13 (2), 167–202.
- Christodoulou, P. (2009) 'La construction de l'image du roi idéal au IV^e siècle av. J.-C. et l'avènement de la royauté hellénistique', PhD dissertation (Université, Panthéon-Sorbonne).
- Chroust, A.-H. (1957) *Socrates, Man and Myth: The Two Socratic Apologies of Xenophon* (London: Routledge & K. Paul).
- Clarke, K. (2008) *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- . (2018) *Shaping the Geography of Empire: Man and Nature in Herodotus' histories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Classen, C.J. (2010) *Herrscher, Bürger und Erzieher: Beobachtungen zu den Reden des Isokrates* (Hildesheim; Zürich: Olms).
- Clay, J.S. (2003) *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Cloch  , P. (1963) *Isocrate et son Temps* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Coates, C.F. (2018) 'Cosmic Democracy or Cosmic Monarchy? Empedocles in Plato's *Statesman*', *Polis*, 35 (2), 418–46.
- Cohen, D. (1991) *Law, Sexuality, and Society: The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Collard, C. (ed.) (1975) *Euripides: Supplices* (Groningen: Bouma's Boekhuis).
- Collard, C. and Cropp, M. (2008) *Euripides: Fragments*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Collins, J.H. (2015) *Exhortations to Philosophy: The Protreptics of Plato, Isocrates, and Aristotle* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Connelly, J.B. (1996) 'Parthenon and Parthenoi: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze', *AJArch*, 100 (1), 53–80.
- Connor, W.R. (1977) 'Tyrannis Polis', in J.H. D'Arms and J.W. Eadie (eds.), *Ancient and Modern. Essays in Honor of Gerald F. Else* (Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Co rdination of Ancient & Modern Studies, University of Michigan), 95–109.
- . (1984) *Thucydides* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

- Coulet, C. (1992) 'Réflexions sur la famille de δίκη dans l'*Enquête* d'Hérodote', *REG*, 105, 371–84.
- Dabashi, H. (2015) *Persophilia: Persian Culture on the Global Scene* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Dalferth, I.U. (2012) 'The Idea of Transcendence', in R.N. Bellah and H. Joas (eds.), 146–88.
- D'Angour, A. (2011) *The Greeks and the New: Novelty in Ancient Greek Imagination and Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Danzig, G. (2002) 'La prétendue rivalité entre Platon et Xénophon', *Revue française d'histoire des idées politiques*, 16, 351–68.
- . (2003a) 'Why Socrates Was Not a Farmer: Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* as a Philosophical Dialogue', *G&R*, 50 (1), 57–76.
- . (2003b) 'Did Plato Read Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*?', in S. Scolnicov and L. Brisson (eds.), 286–97.
- . (2009) 'Big Boys and Little Boys: Justice and Law in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and *Memorabilia*', *Polis*, 26 (2), 271–95.
- . (2012) 'The Best of the Achaemenids: Benevolence, Self-Interest and the "Ironic" Reading of *Cyropaedia*', in F. Hobden and C. Tuplin (eds.), *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry* (Leiden: Brill), 499–539.
- Davie, J.N. (1979) 'Herodotus and Aristophanes on Monarchy', *G&R*, 26 (2), 160–8.
- . (1982) 'Theseus the King in Fifth-Century Athens', *G&R*, 29 (1), 25–34.
- Davies, C. (2019) 'Royal Baby: Meghan, Duchess of Sussex, Gives Birth to Boy', *Guardian*, 6/5/2019. www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/may/06/meghan-duchess-of-sussex-gives-birth-to-boy.
- Dawson, D. (1992) *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Debord, G. (1994) [1967] *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. D. Nicholson-Smith (New York, NY: Zone Books).
- Demont, P. (1990) *La Cité grecque archaïque et classique et l'Idéal de Tranquillité* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Denyer, N. (2013) 'The Political Skill of Protagoras', in V. Harte and M.S. Lane (eds.), 155–67.
- Desclos, M.-L. (2003) *Aux Marges des Dialogues de Platon: essai d'histoire anthropologique de la philosophie ancienne* (Grenoble: J. Millon).
- De Ste. Croix, G.E.M. (1972) *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (London: Duckworth).
- Detienne, M. and Jones, E. (2001) 'The Art of Founding Autochthony: Thebes, Athens, and Old-Stock French', *Arion*, 9 (1), 46–55.
- Detienne, M. and Vernant, J.-P. (1974) *Les Ruses de l'Intelligence: la métis des Grecs* (Paris: Flammarion).
- Dewald, C. (2003) 'Form and Content: The Question of Tyranny in Herodotus', in K.A. Morgan (ed.), 25–58.
- Diels, H. and Kranz, W. (eds.) (1951) *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und Deutsch*, 2 vols. (6th edn.; Berlin: Weidmann).
- Dillery, J. (1995) *Xenophon and the History of His Times* (London: Routledge).
- . (2005) 'Cambyses and the Egyptian *Chaosbeschreibung* Tradition', *CQ*, 55 (2), 387–406.
- Dobrov, G.W. (1990) 'Aristophanes' *Birds* and the Metaphor of Deferral', *Arethusa*, 23, 209–33.

- . (ed.) (1997) *The City as Comedy: Society and Representation in Athenian Drama* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press).
- Dodds, E.R. (1959) *Gorgias: A Revised Text* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Döring, K. (2011) 'The Students of Socrates', in D.R. Morrison (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 24–47.
- Dorion, L.-A. (2000) 'Euthydème et Dionysodore sont-ils des Mégariques?', in T.M. Robinson and L. Brisson (eds.), *Plato: Euthydemus, Lysis, Charmides* (Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag), 35–50.
- . (2002) 'La responsabilité de Cyrus dans le déclin de l'empire perse selon Platon et Xénophon', *Revue française d'histoire des idées politiques*, 16, 369–86.
- . (2003) 'Une Allusion à la *Cyropédie* au livre III des *Lois* (694c)', in S. Scolnicov and L. Brisson (eds.), 281–5.
- . (2004) 'Socrate et la *basilikê tekhnê*: essai d'exégèse comparative', in V. Karasmanis (ed.), *Socrates: 2400 Years Since His Death (399 B.C.–2001 A.D.)* (Athens: Eurōpaiko Politistiko Kentro Delphōn), 51–62.
- . (2008) 'Héraklès entre Prodicos et Xénophon', *Philosophie Antique*, 8, 85–114.
- . (2010) 'The Straussian Exegesis of Xenophon: The Paradigmatic Case of *Memorabilia* IV 4', in Gray, V.J. (ed.), *Xenophon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 283–323.
- . (2011) 'The Rise and Fall of the Socratic Problem', in D.R. Morrison (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1–23.
- Dorion, L.-A. and Bandini, M. (2000) *Mémorables. 1, Introduction générale, Livre I* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- . (2011) *Xénophon: Mémorables*, 2 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Dover, K.J. (1972) *Aristophanic Comedy* (London: Batsford).
- Drerup, E. (1906) *Isocratis Opera omnia*. 1 (Leipzig: Sumptibus Dieterichii (Theodori Weicher)).
- Due, B. (1989) *The Cyropaedia: Xenophon's Aims and Methods* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press).
- Dümmmler, F. (1889) *Akademika: Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte der sokratischen Schulen* (Giessen: J. Ricker).
- Dunbar, N. (1995) *Aristophanes: Birds* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Easterling, P.E. (1985) 'Anachronism in Greek Tragedy', *JHS*, 105, 1–10.
- . (1997) 'The Language of the Polis in *Oedipus at Colonus*', in I.-T.A. Papadēmētriou (ed.), *Praktika, prōto Panellēnio kai Diethnes Synedrio Archaia Hellēnikēs Philologias*, 23–26 Maïou 1994 (Athens: Hellenic Society for Humanistic Studies), 273–83.
- Eder, W. (1995) 'Monarchie und Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: die Rolle des Fürstenspiegels in der athenischen Demokratie', in W. Eder (ed.), *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* (Stuttgart: Steiner), 153–73.
- Edmunds, L. (1996) *Theatrical Space and Historical Place in Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield).
- Ehrenberg, V. (1938) *Alexander and the Greeks* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Ellis, A. (2016) 'A Socratic History: Theology in Xenophon's Rewriting of Herodotus' *Croesus Logos*', *JHS*, 136, 73–91.
- El Murr, D. (2010) 'Hesiod, Plato and the Golden Age: Hesiodic Motifs in the Myth of the *Politicus*', in G.R. Boys-Stones and J. Haubold (eds.), *Plato and Hesiod* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 276–97.

- . (2014) *Savoir et Gouverner: essai sur la science politique platonicienne* (Paris: Vrin).
- Emlyn-Jones, C.J. (1980) *The Ionians and Hellenism: A Study of the Cultural Achievement of the Early Greek Inhabitants of Asia Minor* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Erbse, H. (1961) 'Die Architektonik im Aufbau von Xenophons *Memorabilien*', *Hermes*, 89 (3), 257–87.
- . (1980) 'Aristipp und Sokrates bei Xenophon (Bemerkungen zu *Mem.* 2,1)', *WJA*, 6, 7–19.
- Euben, J.P. (1996) 'Reading Democracy: "Socratic" Dialogues and the Political Education of Democratic Citizens', in J. Ober and C.W. Hedrick (eds.), *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 327–59.
- . (2003) *Platonic Noise* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Eucken, C. (1983) *Isokrates: Seine Positionen in der Auseinandersetzung mit den Zeitgenössischen Philosophen* (Berlin: de Gruyter).
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. (1948) *The Divine Kingship of the Shilluk of the Nilotic Sudan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Everson, S. (1988) *Aristotle: The Politics*, trans. B. Jowett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Fairman, H.W. (1958) 'The Kingship Rituals of Egypt', in S.H. Hooke (ed.), *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 74–104.
- Farrar, C. (2013) 'Putting History in Its Place: Plato, Thucydides and the Athenian *politeia*', in V. Harte and M.S. Lane (eds.), 32–56.
- Fehling, D. (1989) *Herodotus and his "Sources": Citation, Invention and Narrative Art*, trans. J.G. Howie (Liverpool: Cairns).
- Ferrari, G.R.F. (1995) 'Myth and Conservatism in Plato's *Statesman*', in C.J. Rowe (ed.), *Reading the Statesman: Proceedings of the III Symposium Platonicum* (International Plato Studies; Sankt Augustin: Academia), 389–98.
- Ferrill, A. (1978) 'Herodotus on Tyranny', *Historia*, 27, 385–98.
- Filmer, R. (1991) *Patriarcha and Other Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Flaig, E. (2011) 'La révolution athénienne de 507: un mythe fondateur "oublié"', in V. Azoulay and P. Ismard (eds.), *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes: autour du politique dans la cité classique* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne), 59–66.
- Flood, C. (1996) *Political Myth: A Theoretical Introduction* (New York, NY: Garland).
- Flory, S. (1987) *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press).
- Flower, M.A. and Marincola, J. (2002) *Herodotus: Histories IX* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Folch, M. (2016) *The Polis and the Stage: Performance, Genre, and Gender in Plato's Laws* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Foley, H.P. (1988) 'Tragedy and Politics in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*', *JHS*, 108, 33–47.
- Ford, A.L. (2010) 'ΣΩΚΡΑΤΙΚΟΙ ΛΟΓΟΙ in Aristotle and Fourth-Century Theories of Genre', *CPh*, 105 (3), 221–35.
- Foster, M. (2019) 'What's in a Name? Japan Debates Meaning of New "Reiwa" Imperial Era', *Reuters*, 2/4/2019, Asia News. www.reuters.com/article/japan-emperor-calendar/whats-in-a-name-japan-debates-meaning-of-new-reiwa-imperial-era-idUSL3N21K0ZO

- Foucault, M. (1976) [1969] *Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A.M.S. Smith (New York, NY and London: Harper & Row).
- . (1981) 'Omnes et Singulatim: Towards a Criticism of "Political Reason"', *Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, 223–54. https://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_documents/a-to-z/f/foucault81.pdf, accessed 09/01/2019.
- Fowler, R.L. (1996) 'Herodotos and His Contemporaries', *JHS*, 116, 62–87.
- . (2013) *Early Greek Mythography. Vol 2: Commentaries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Foxhall, L., Gehrke, H.-J., and Luraghi, N. (eds.) (2010) *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner).
- Frankfort, H. (1948) *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Frazer, J.G. (1911) *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* (3rd edn.; London: Macmillan).
- Frede, D. (2012) 'The Endoxon Mystique: What Endoxa Are and What They Are Not', *OSAPh*, 43, 185–215.
- Gagarin, M. (1976) *Aeschylean Drama* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- Gagné, R. (2013) *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Galinsky, K. (1972) *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature From Homer to the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Gammie, J.G. (1986) 'Herodotus on Kings and Tyrants: Objective Historiography or Conventional Portraiture?', *JNES*, 45 (3), 171–95.
- Garvie, A.F. (1969) *Aeschylus' Supplikes: Play and Trilogy* (London: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2009) *Aeschylus: Persae* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Gastaldi, S. (2009) 'Il re "signore di tutto": il problema della *pambasileia* nella *Politica* di Aristotele', in S. Gastaldi and J.-F. Pradeau (eds.), *Le philosophe, le roi, le tyran: études sur les figures royale et tyrannique dans la pensée politique grecque et sa postérité* (Sankt Augustin: Akademie Verlag), 33–52.
- Geertz, C. (1983) 'Centers, Kings, and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power', in *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology* (New York, NY: Basic Books), 121–46.
- Gehrke, H.-J. (1994) 'Mythos, Geschichte, Politik: Antik und Modern', *Saeculum*, 45, 239–64.
- . (2001) 'Myth, History and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond', in N. Luraghi (ed.), 286–313.
- . (2004) 'Was Heißt und zu welchem Ende studiert man Intentionale Geschichte? Marathon und Troja als fundierende Mythen', in G. Melville and K.-S. Rehberg (eds.), *Gründungsmythen, Genealogien, Memorialzeichen: Beiträge zur institutionellen Konstruktion von Kontinuität* (Köln: Böhlau), 21–36.
- . (2011) 'Myth, History, Politics – Ancient and Modern', in J. Marincola (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography*, trans. M. Beck (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 40–71.
- Gera, D.L. (1993) *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Ghezzi, M.V. (1938–39) 'I Persiani di Eschilo', *Atti del Reale Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti*, 98 (2), 427–48.
- Giannantoni, G. (1990) *Socratis et Socraticorum reliquiae* (Naples: Bibliopolis).

- Gigante, M. (1956) *Nomos basileus* (Naples: Edizioni Glauk).
- Gill, C. (1977) 'The Genre of the Atlantis Story', *CPh*, 72 (4), 287–304.
- . (1979) 'Plato and Politics: The *Critias* and the *Politicus*', *Phronesis*, 24 (2), 148–67.
- . (1995) 'Rethinking Constitutionalism in *Statesman* 291–303', in C.J. Rowe (ed.), *Reading the Statesman: Proceedings of the III Symposium Platonicum* (Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag), 292–305.
- . (2017) *Plato's Atlantis Story: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press).
- Gill, C. and McCabe, M.M. (eds.) (1996) *Form and Argument in Late Plato* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Gill, M.L. (2012) *Philosophos: Plato's Missing Dialogue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Girard, R. (2013) [1977] *Violence and the Sacred*, trans. P. Gregory (London: Bloomsbury Academic).
- Giraudeau, M. (1984) *Les Notions juridiques et sociales chez Hérodote: études sur le vocabulaire* (Paris: Diffusion de Boccard).
- Goldhill, S.D. (1987) 'The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology', *JHS*, 107, 58–76.
- . (1988) 'Battle Narrative and Politics in Aeschylus' *Persae*', *JHS*, 108, 189–93.
- . (1991) *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2000) 'Civic Ideology and the Problem of Difference: The Politics of Aeschylean Tragedy, Once Again', *JHS*, 120, 34–56.
- Gomme, A.W. (1938) 'Aristophanes and Politics', *CR*, 52 (3), 97–109.
- Goossens, R. (1932) 'Périclès et Thésée. A propos des *Suppliants* d'Euripide', *BAGD*, 35, 9–40.
- . (1962) *Euripide et Athènes* (Bruxelles: Palais des Académies).
- Gotteland, S. (1998) 'Généalogies mythiques et politique chez les orateurs attiques', in D. Auger and S. Saïd (eds.), *Généalogies Mythiques* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres), 379–93.
- . (2001) *Mythe et Rhétorique: les Exemples mythiques dans le Discours politique de l'Athènes classique* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Gould, J. (1973) 'Hiketeia', *JHS*, 93, 74–103.
- Gourmelen, L. (2004) *Kékrops, le roi-serpent: imaginaire athénien, représentations de l'humain et de l'animalité en Grèce ancienne* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Graeber, D. (2017a) 'The Divine Kingship of the Shilluk: On Violence, Utopia and the Human Condition', in M. Sahlins and D. Graeber (eds.), 65–138.
- . (2017b) 'Notes on the Politics of Divine Kingship', in M. Sahlins and D. Graeber (eds.), 377–464.
- Graham, D.W. (2005) 'The Topology and Dynamics of Empedocles' Cycle', in A.L. Pierris (ed.), 225–44.
- . (2010) *The Texts of Early Greek Philosophy: The Complete Fragments and Selected Testimonies of the Major Presocratics*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Gray, V.J. (1989) *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica* (London: Duckworth).
- . (1996) 'Herodotus and Images of Tyranny: The Tyrants of Corinth', *AJPhil*, 117 (3), 361–89.
- . (1998) *The Framing of Socrates: The Literary Interpretation of Xenophon's Memorabilia* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner).

- . (2000) 'Xenophon and Isocrates', in C.J. Rowe and M. Schofield (eds.), 142–54.
- . (2006) 'The Linguistic Philosophies of Prodicus in Xenophon's "Choice of Heracles"', *CQ*, 56 (2), 426–35.
- . (2011a) 'Thucydides' Source Citations: "It Is Said"', *CQ*, 61 (1), 75–90.
- . (2011b) 'Xenophon's Socrates and Democracy', *Polis*, 28 (1), 1–32.
- . (2011c) *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes: Reading the Reflections* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Grethlein, J. (2010) 'Beyond Intentional History: A Phenomenological Model of the Idea of History', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi (eds.), 327–42.
- Grethlein, J. and Krebs, C.B. (eds.) (2012) *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: The 'Plupast' from Herodotus to Appian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Griffin, J. (1998) 'The Social Function of Attic Tragedy', *CQ*, 48 (1), 39–61.
- Griffith, M. (1995) 'Brilliant Dynasts: Power and Politics in the *Oresteia*', *ClAnt*, 14 (1), 62–129.
- . (1998) 'The King and Eye: The Role of the Father in Greek Tragedy', *PCPhS*, 44, 20–84.
- Grote, G. (1865) *Plato and the Other Companions of Sokrates* (London: Murray).
- Grube, G.M.A. (1926) 'On the Authenticity of the *Hippias Maior*', *CQ*, 20 (3/4), 134–48.
- Gruen, E.S. (ed.) (2010) *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute).
- . (2011) *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Guthrie, W.K.C. (1971) *The Sophists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Haake, M. (2007) *Der Philosoph in der Stadt: Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in der hellenistischen Polis* (München: C.H. Beck).
- . (2013) 'Writing Down the King: The Communicative Function of Treatises of Kingship in the Hellenistic Period', in N. Luraghi (ed.), 165–206.
- Hadot, P. (1972) 'Fürstenspiegel', in T. Klauser (ed.), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann), 555–632.
- Hägg, T. (2012) *The Art of Biography in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hahn, D.E. (2000) 'Kings and Constitutions: Hellenistic Theories', in C.J. Rowe and M. Schofield (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 457–76.
- Hall, E. (1989) *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- . (1996) *Persians* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips).
- . (2010) *Greek Tragedy: Suffering Under the Sun* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Halliwell, S. (1990) 'Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character', in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 32–59.
- Halper, E.C. (2009) *One and Many in Aristotle's Metaphysics: Books Alpha-Delta* (Las Vegas: Parmenides).
- Hammond, N.G.L. (1979) *A History of Macedonia. Vol. 2, 550–336 B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Hanink, J. (2013) 'Epitaphioi Mythoi and Tragedy as Encomium of Athens', *Trends in Classics*, 5 (2), 289–317.

- . (2014a) 'The Great Dionysia and the End of the Peloponnesian War', *ClAnt*, 33 (2), 319–46.
- . (2014b) *Lycurgan Athens and the Making of Classical Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hansen, M.H. (1975) *Eisangelia: The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens in the Fourth Century B.C. and the Impeachment of Generals and Politicians* (Odense: Odense University Press).
- . (1999) *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles, and Ideology* (2nd edn.; Bristol: Bristol Classical Press).
- . (ed.) (2005) *The Imaginary Polis: Symposium, January 7–10, 2004* (Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab).
- Harding, P. (1988) 'Laughing at Isokrates: Humour in the *Areopagitikos*?', *LCM*, 13 (2), 18–23.
- . (1993) *Androtion and the Atthis: Fragments Translated with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- . (2007) 'Local History and Attidography', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford: Blackwell), 180–8.
- . (2008) *The Story of Athens: The Fragments of the Local Chronicles of Attika* (London: Routledge).
- Harrison, T. (2000) *The Emptiness of Asia: Aeschylus' Persians and the History of the Fifth Century* (London: Duckworth).
- . (2003) 'Upside Down and Back to Front: Herodotus and the Greek Encounter with Egypt', in R. Matthews and C. Römer (eds.), *Ancient Perspectives on Egypt* (London: UCL Press), 145–55.
- Harte, V. (2002) *Plato on Parts and Wholes: The Metaphysics of Structure* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Harte, V. and Lane, M.S. (eds.) (2013) *Politeia in Greek and Roman Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Harvey, F.D. (1965) 'Two Kinds of Equality', *C&M*, 26, 101–46.
- . (1966) 'Corrigenda to C&M XXVI 1965 101–146', *C&M*, 27, 99–100.
- Haskins, E.V. (2004) *Logos and Power in Isocrates and Aristotle* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press).
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. (2003) 'Herodotos (8. 137–8): The Manumissions From Leukopetra, and the Topography of the Middle Haliakmon Valley', in P. Derow and R. Parker (eds.), *Herodotus and His World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 203–18.
- Hau, L.I. (2016) *Moral History From Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Haubold, J. (2015) "'Shepherds of the People": Greek and Mesopotamian Perspectives', in R. Rollinger and E. van Dongen (eds.), *Mesopotamia in the Ancient World: Impact, Continuities, Parallels* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag), 245–54.
- Hawes, G. (2014) *Rationalizing Myth in Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Hawtrey, R.S.W. (1981) *Commentary on Plato's Euthydemus* (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society).
- Heath, M. (1997) 'Aristophanes and the Discourse of Politics', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), 230–49.
- Heilbrunn, G. (1977) 'The Composition of Isocrates' *Helen*', *TAPA*, 107, 147–59.
- Hekster, O. and Fowler, R. (eds.) (2005) *Imaginary Kings: Royal Images in the Ancient Near East, Greece and Rome* (Stuttgart: Steiner).

- Helm, P.R. (1981) 'Herodotus' *Médikos Logos* and Median History', *Iran*, 19, 85–90.
- Henderson, J. (1990) *Aristophanes: Lysistrata* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- . (1997) 'Mass Versus Elite and the Comic Heroism of Peisetairos', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), 135–48.
- Heusch, L. de (1987) *Écrits sur la Royauté sacrée* (Bruxelles: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles).
- . (1997) 'The Symbolic Mechanisms of Sacred Kingship: Rediscovering Frazer', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 3 (2), 213–32.
- Hickman, R.M. (1938) *Ghostly Etiquette on the Classical Stage* (Cedar Rapids, IA: Torch Press).
- Hicks, R.D. and Susemihl, F. (1894) *The Politics of Aristotle: A Revised Text, Books I–V* (London: Macmillan).
- Higgins, W.E. (1977) *Xenophon the Athenian: The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press).
- Hirsch, S.W. (1985) *The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England).
- Hobbes, T. (1996) [1651], *Leviathan*, ed. R. Tuck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hobsbawm, E.J. (1983) 'Introduction: Inventing Traditions', in E.J. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds.), 1–14.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. and Ranger, T. (eds.) (1983) *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hocart, A.M. (1927) *Kingship* (London: Oxford University Press).
- . (1970) [1936] *Kings and Councillors: An Essay in the Comparative Anatomy of Human Society* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Hodkinson, S. (2005) 'The Imaginary Spartan *Politeia*', in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Imaginary Polis: Symposium, January 7–10, 2004* (Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab), 222–81.
- Hoekstra, K. (2016) 'Athenian Democracy and Popular Tyranny', in R. Bourke and Q. Skinner (eds.), *Popular Sovereignty in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 15–51.
- Hoff, R. van der (2010) 'Media for Theseus, or the Different Images of the Athenian Polis-Hero', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi (eds.), 161–88.
- Hofmann, H. (1976) *Mythos und Komödie: Untersuchungen zu den Vögeln des Aristophanes* (Hildesheim: G. Olms).
- Höistad, R. (1948) *Cynic Hero and Cynic King: Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man* (Lund: Blom).
- Holzhausen, J. (2002) 'Pandora und Basileia: Hesiod-Rezeption in Aristophanes' *Vögeln*', *Philologus*, 146 (1), 34–45.
- Horky, P.S. (2009) 'Persian Cosmos and Greek Philosophy: Plato's Associates and the Zoroastrian *magoi*', *OSAPh*, 37, 47–103.
- . (forthcoming) 'Anonymus Iamblichii, On Excellence (Περὶ ἀρετῆς): A Lost Defense of Democracy', in D. Wolfsdorf (ed.), *Early Greek Ethics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- . (ed.) (2019) *Cosmos in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Horn, C. (2012) 'Why Two Epochs of Human History? On the Myth of the *Statesman*', in C. Collobert, P. Destrée, and F.J. Gonzalez (eds.), *Plato And Myth: Studies on the Use and Status of Platonic Myths* (Mnemosyne Supplements; Leiden: Brill), 393–417.

- Hornblower, S. (1991–2008) *A Commentary on Thucydides*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- . (2006) 'Pindar and Kingship Theory', in S. Lewis (ed.), *Ancient Tyranny* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 151–63.
- How, W.W. and Wells, J. (1989) *A Commentary on Herodotus with Introduction and Appendixes*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Hudson-Williams, H.L. (1948) 'Thucydides, Isocrates, and the Rhetorical Method of Composition', *CQ*, 42 (3/4), 76–81.
- Humphreys, S.C. (2004) *The Strangeness of Gods: Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Hurwit, J.M. (1999) *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hutchinson, G.O. (2011) 'House Politics and City Politics in Aristophanes', *CQ*, 61 (1), 48–70.
- Immerwahr, H.R. (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press).
- Irwin, T. (1977) *Plato's Moral Theory: The Early and Middle Dialogues* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Jackson, R. (1990) 'Socrates' Iolaos: Myth and Eristic in Plato's *Euthydemus*', *CQ*, 40 (2), 378–95.
- Jacoby, F. (1902) 'Die attische Königsliste I', *Klio*, 2, 406–39.
- . (1909) 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio*, 9, 80–123.
- . (1929) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Zweiter teil, Zeitgeschichte, B, Spezialgeschichten, autobiographien, zeittafeln* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung).
- . (1930) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker T.2, Zeitgeschichte. D, Kommentar zu Nr. 106–261* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung).
- . (1949) *Atthis, the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- . (1954a) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker: notes (T.3, Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie). b (supplement), Commentary on the Ancient Historians of Athens (nos. 323a–334). Vol. 2, Notes, Addenda, Corrigenda, Index*; (Leiden: Brill).
- . (1954b) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker: Commentary (T.3, Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horographie und Ethnographie). b (supplement), Commentary on the Ancient Historians of Athens (nos. 323a–334)*; (Leiden: Brill).
- Jaeger, W. (1939) *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, ed. G. Highet, 3 vols. (Oxford: B. Blackwell).
- Janssen, J.J. (1978) 'The Early State in Ancient Egypt', in H.J.M. Claessen and P. Skalnik (eds.), *The Early State* (Berlin: De Gruyter), 213–34.
- Jaspers, K. (1953) [1949] *The Origin and Goal of History*, trans. M. Bullock (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Joël, K. (1893) *Der echte und der xenophontische Sokrates*, 3 vols. (Berlin: R. Gaertner).
- Johansen, H.F. (1970) *Aeschylus: The Suppliants* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal).
- Johnson, D.M. (2001) 'Herodotus' Storytelling Speeches: Socles (5.92) and Leotychides (6.86)', *CJ*, 97 (1), 1–26.
- . (2005) 'Xenophon at His Most Socratic (*Memorabilia* 4.2)', *OSAPh*, 29, 39–73.
- . (2009) 'Aristippus at the Crossroads: The Politics of Pleasure in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*', *Polis*, 26 (2), 204–22.

- Johnstone, S. (1994) 'Virtuous Toil, Vicious Work: Xenophon on Aristocratic Style', *CPh*, 89 (3), 219–40.
- Joyce, C.J. (1999) 'Was Hellanikos the First Chronicler of Athens?', *Histos*, 3. http://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/Histos_BackIssues1999.html, accessed 31/07/2011.
- Kahn, C.H. (1981) *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus: An Edition of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (1990) 'The Normative Structure of Aristotle's *Politics*', in G. Patzig (ed.), 369–84.
- . (1994) 'Aeschines and Socratic *eros*', in P.A. Vander Waerdt (ed.), 87–106.
- . (2000) 'Some Puzzles in the *Euthydemus*', in L. Brisson and T.M. Robinson (eds.), *Plato: Euthydemus, Lysis, Charmides* (Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag), 88–97.
- . (2009) 'The Myth of the *Statesman*', in C. Partenie (ed.), 148–66.
- Kallet, L. (2003) '*Demos Tyrannos*: Wealth, Power, and Economic Patronage', in K.A. Morgan (ed.), 117–53.
- Kamp, A. (1985) *Die politische Philosophie des Aristoteles und ihre metaphysischen Grundlagen: Wesenstheorie und Polisordnung* (Freiburg: Alber).
- Kamtekar, R. (2013) 'Ancient Virtue Ethics', in D.C. Russell (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 29–48.
- Kantorowicz, E.H. (1957) *The King's Two Bodies; A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Kearns, E. (1989) *The Heroes of Attica* (London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies).
- . (1990) 'Saving the City', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 323–44.
- Kehl, H. (1962) 'Die Monarchie im politischen Denken des Isokrates', PhD dissertation (Friedrich-Wilhelms-Univ).
- Keiper, P. (1877) *Die Perser des Aeschylus als Quelle für altpersische Altertumskunde nebst Erklärung der darin vorkommenden altpersischen Eigennamen* (Erlangen: Verlag von A. Deichert).
- Kelsen, H. (1937) 'The Philosophy of Aristotle and the Hellenic-Macedonian Policy', *International Journal of Ethics*, 48 (1), 1–64.
- Kemp, B.J. (1983) 'Old Kingdom, Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period c. 2686–1552 BC', in B.G. Trigger et al. (eds.), *Ancient Egypt: A Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 71–182.
- Kennedy, G.A. (1958) 'Isocrates' *Encomium of Helen*: A Panhellenic Document', *TAPA*, 89, 77–83.
- Kennedy, R.F. (2013) 'A Tale of Two Kings: Competing Aspects of Power in Aeschylus' *Persians*', *Ramus*, 42 (1–2), 64–88.
- . (2014) *Immigrant Women in Athens: Gender, Ethnicity, and Citizenship in the Classical City* (New York, NY: Routledge).
- Keulen, H. (1971) *Untersuchungen zu Platons Euthydem* (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz).
- Key, D. (1999) *Aristotle Politics: Books V and VI* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Kingsley, K.S. (2018) 'Justifying Violence in Herodotus' Histories 3.38: Nomos, King of All, and Pindaric Poetics', in E. Bowie (ed.), *Herodotus – Narrator, Scientist, Historian* (*Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes*; Berlin: De Gruyter), 37–58.
- Kleinknecht, H. (1966) 'Herodot und die Makedonische Urgeschichte', *Hermes*, 94 (2), 134–46.

- Knox, B.M.W. (1964) *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- . (1982) 'Sophocles and the Polis', in J. de Romilly (ed.), *Sophocle. Sept exposés suivis de discussions* (Geneva: Fondation Hardt), 1–37.
- Konstan, D. (1985) 'The Politics of Aristophanes' *Wasps*', *TAPA*, 115, 27–46.
- . (1990) 'A City in the Air: Aristophanes' *Birds*', *Arethusa*, 23, 183–207.
- Kopperschmidt, J. (1971) 'Hikesie als Dramatische Form', in W. Jens (ed.), *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie* (München: W. Fink), 321–46.
- Körner, C. (2017) 'Monarchie auf Zypern im 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Herrschaft von König und Polis?', in S. Rebenich and J. Wienand (eds.), *Monarchische Herrschaft im Altertum* (Berlin: De Gruyter), 217–43.
- Koselleck, R. (1985) [1979] *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. K. Tribe (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Kouloumentas, S. (2009) 'The Conception of Cosmic Justice in Early Greek Philosophy', PhD (University of Cambridge).
- Kovacs, D. (1982) 'Tyrants and Demagogues in Tragic Interpolation', *GRBS*, 23, 31–50.
- . (1998) *Euripides: Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Kuhr, A. (2007a) *The Persian Empire: A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period* (London: Routledge).
- . (2007b) 'Cyrus the Great of Persia: Images and Realities', in M. Heinz and M.H. Feldman (eds.), *Representations of Political Power: Case Histories from Times of Change and Dissolving Order in the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), 169–91.
- Kurke, L. (1999a) 'Ancient Greek Board Games and How to Play Them', *CPh*, 94 (3), 247–67.
- . (1999b) *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Labarbe, J. (1971) 'L'apparition de la notion de tyrannie dans la Grèce archaïque', *AC*, 40, 471–504.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (2003) *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Laks, A. (1990) 'Legislation and Demiurgy: On the Relationship Between Plato's *Republic* and *Laws*', *ClAnt*, 9 (2), 209–29.
- . (1996) 'Le Double du Roi. Remarques sur le antécédents hésiodiques du philosophe-roi', in F. Blaise, P. Judet de La Combe, and P. Rousseau (eds.), *Le Métier du Mythe: lectures d'Hésiode* (Lille: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion), 83–92.
- Lane, M.S. (1997) *Method and Politics in Plato's Statesman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2013) 'Claims to Rule: The Case of the Multitude', in M. Deslauriers and P. Desrèe (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 247–74.
- Lasserre, F. (1976) 'Hérodote et Protagoras. Le débat sur les constitutions', *MH*, 33, 65–84.
- Latainer, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

- Laurand, V. (2011) 'Nature de la royauté dans les *Politiques* d'Aristote', in E. Bermon, V. Laurand, and J. Terrel (eds.), *Politique d'Aristote: famille, régimes, éducation* (Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux), 71–87.
- Lawton, C.L. (1995) *Attic Document Reliefs: Art and Politics in Ancient Athens* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Lefèvre, E. (1971) 'Die Frage nach dem βίος εὐδαιμόνων. Die Begegnung zwischen Kyros und Kroisos bei Xenophon', *Hermes*, 99, 283–96.
- Lefort, C. (1988) [1986] *Democracy and Political Theory*, trans. D. Macey (Cambridge: Polity).
- . (2007) 'Démocratie et avènement d'un "lieu vide"', in C. Lefort (ed.), *Le Temps Présent: écrits 1945–2005* (Paris: Belin), 461–9.
- Lévêque, P. and Vidal-Naquet, P. (1996) [1964] *Cleisthenes the Athenian*, trans. D.A. Curtis (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books).
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1963) *Structural Anthropology*, trans. C. Jacobson and B.G. Schoepf (New York, NY: Basic Books).
- . (1994) [1964] *The Raw and the Cooked: Introduction to a Science of Mythology*, trans. J. Weightman and D. Weightman (London: Pimlico).
- Lewis, D.M. and Stroud, R.S. (1979) 'Athens Honors King Euagoras of Salamis', *Hesperia*, 48 (2), 180–93.
- Leyden, W. von (1949–50) '*Spatium Historicum*: The Historical Past as Viewed by Hecataeus, Herodotus and Thucydides', *Durham University Journal*, 11, 89–104.
- Livingstone, N. (2001) *A Commentary on Isocrates' Busiris* (Leiden: Brill).
- Lloyd, A.B. (1975–1988) *Herodotus*, book II, 3 vols. (Leiden: Brill).
- . (1988) 'Herodotus' Account of Pharaonic History', *Historia*, 37 (1), 22–53.
- . (2007) 'Book II', in D. Asheri, A.B. Lloyd, and A. Corcella (eds.), *A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I–IV* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 219–378.
- . (2010) 'The Reception of Pharaonic Egypt in Classical Antiquity', in A.B. Lloyd (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Egypt* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell), 1067–85.
- Lloyd, G.E.R. (1966) *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Lockwood, T.C. (2017) 'The Political Theorizing of Aeschylus's *Persians*', *Interpretation*, 43 (383–401).
- . (2018) 'Servile Spartans and Free Citizen-Soldiers in Aristotle's *Politics* 7–8', *Apeiron*, 51 (1), 97–123.
- Long, A. (2013) 'The Political Art in Plato's *Republic*', in V. Harte and M.S. Lane (eds.), 15–31.
- Loprieno, A. (1996) 'The "King's Novel"', in A. Loprieno (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms* (Probleme der Ägyptologie; Leiden: Brill), 277–95.
- L'Orange, H.P. (1953) *Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World* (Oslo: H. Aschehoug).
- Loraux, N. (1976) 'Problèmes Grecs de la Démocratie Moderne', *Critique*, 32 (355 (Décembre)), 1276–87.
- . (1981) *L'Invention d'Athènes: histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la 'cité classique'* (Paris: Mouton).
- . (1986) *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, trans. A. Sheridan (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- . (1993a) [1984] *The Children of Athena: Athenian Ideas About Citizenship and the Division Between the Sexes*, trans. C. Levine (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

- . (1993b) *L'Invention d'Athènes: histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la 'cité classique'* (2nd edn.; Paris: Payot).
- . (1993c) 'Ce que les Perses ont peut-être appris aux Athéniens', *Épokhè*, 3, 147–64.
- . (2000) [1996] *Born of the Earth: Myth and Politics in Athens*, trans. S. Stewart (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Lovejoy, A.O. and Boas, G. (1997) [1935] *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Luccioni, J. (1948) *Les Idées politiques et sociales de Xénophon* (Paris: Ophrys).
- Luce, J.-M. (2005) 'Erechthée, Thésée, les Tyrannoctones et les espaces publics athéniens', in E. Greco (ed.), *Teseo e Romolo: le origini di Atene e Roma a confronto* (Tripodes; Athens: Scuola archeologica italiana di Atene), 143–64.
- Luraghi, N. (ed.) (2001) *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- . (2013a) 'Ruling Alone: Monarchy in Greek Politics and Thought', in N. Luraghi (ed.), 11–24.
- . (ed.) (2013b) *The Splendors and Miseries of Ruling Alone* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner).
- . (2014) 'Ephorus in Context', in G. Parmeggiani (ed.), 133–52.
- . (2015) 'Anatomy of the Monster: The Discourse of Tyranny in Ancient Greece', in H. Börm and W. Havener (eds.), *Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity* (Stuttgart: Steiner), 67–84.
- Luz, M. (1996) 'Antisthenes' Prometheus Myth', in J. Glucker, A. Laks, and V. Barre (eds.), *Jacob Bernays: un philologue juif* (Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion), 89–103.
- Maass, E. (1887) 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Griechischen Prosa', *Hermes*, 22 (4), 566–95.
- MacDowell, D.M. (1971) *Aristophanes: Wasps* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Macé, A. (2017) 'Purifications et Distributions Sociales: Platon et le Pastorat Politique', *Philosophie Antique*, 17, 101–23.
- Machiavelli, N. (1988) [1532] *The Prince*, eds Q. Skinner and R. Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- MacIntyre, A.C. (1985) *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (2nd edn.; London: Duckworth).
- Mader, G. (2006) 'Fighting Philip With Decrees: Demosthenes and the Syndrome of Symbolic Action', *AJPh*, 127 (3), 367–86.
- Mandilaras, B.G. (ed.) (2003) *Isocrates: Opera Omnia* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Mantel, H. (2013) 'Royal Bodies', *London Review of Books*, 35 (4), 3–7.
- Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (1999) 'Genre, Convention and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography', in C.S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Mnemosyne Supplements; Leiden: Brill), 281–324.
- . (2007) 'Universal History From Ephorus to Diodorus', in J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford: Blackwell), 171–9.
- . (2014) 'Rethinking Isocrates and Historiography', in G. Parmeggiani (ed.), 39–61.
- Markantonatos, A. (2007) *Oedipus at Colonus: Sophocles, Athens, and the World* (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Masaracchia, A. (1995) *Isocrate: retorica e politica* (Roma: GEI).

- . (2003) 'Isocrate e il Mito', in W. Orth (ed.), *Isokrates: Neue Ansätze zur Bewertung eines Politischen Schriftstellers* (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier), 150–68.
- Mathieu, G. (1925) *Les Idées Politiques d'Isocrate* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Mathieu, G. and Brémond, É. (eds.) (1928–62) *Isocrate: Discours* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Mayhew, R. (1997) 'Part and Whole in Aristotle's Political Philosophy', *Journal of Ethics*, 1 (4), 325–40.
- . (2008) *Plato Laws X* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- . (2010) 'The Theology of the *Laws*', in C. Bobonich (ed.), *Plato's Laws: A Critical Guide* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 197–216.
- McInerney, J. (1994) 'Politicizing the Past: The *Atthis* of Kleidemos', *ClAnt*, 13 (1), 17–37.
- McNamara, C. (2009) 'Socratic Politics in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*', *Polis*, 26 (2), 223–45.
- Meier, C. (1993) *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*, trans. A.J. Webber (Cambridge: Polity).
- Meier, M. et al. (2004) *Deiokes, König der Meder: eine Herodot-Episode in ihren Kontexten* (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Melville, C.P. and Mitchell, L.G. (eds.) (2013) *Every Inch a King: Comparative Studies on Kings and Kingship in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds* (Leiden: Brill).
- Mendelsohn, D.A. (2002) *Gender and the City in Euripides' Political Plays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Merlan, P. (1954) 'Isocrates, Aristotle and Alexander the Great', *Historia*, 3 (1), 60–81.
- Michellini, A.N. (1982) *Tradition and Dramatic Form in the Persians of Aeschylus* (Leiden: Brill).
- . (1991) 'The Maze of the Logos: Euripides, *Suppliants* 163–249', *Ramus*, 20, 16–36.
- . (1994) 'Political Themes in Euripides' *Suppliants*', *AJPh*, 115 (2), 219–52.
- Mikalson, J.D. (1976) 'Erechtheus and the Panathenaia', *AJPh*, 97 (2), 141–53.
- Miller, M.H. (2004) *The Philosopher in Plato's Statesman* (Las Vegas, NV: Parmenides).
- Mills, S. (1997) *Theseus, Tragedy, and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Mitchell, B.M. (1975) 'Herodotus and Samos', *JHS*, 95, 75–91.
- Mitchell, L.G. (2007) *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales).
- . (2008) 'Thucydides and the Monarch in Democracy', *Polis*, 25 (1), 1–30.
- . (2013) *The Heroic Rulers of Archaic and Classical Greece* (London: Bloomsbury Academic).
- Mohr, R.D. and Sattler, B.M. (eds.) (2010) *One Book, the Whole Universe: Plato's Timaeus Today* (Las Vegas, NV: Parmenides).
- Moles, J. (1984) 'The Addressee of the Third Kingship Oration of Dio Chrysostom', *Prometheus*, 10, 65–9.
- . (1995) 'The Cynics and Politics', in A. Laks and M. Schofield (eds.), *Justice and Generosity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 129–58.
- . (1996) 'Herodotus Warns the Athenians', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, 9, 259–84.
- Möller, A. (2001) 'The Beginning of Chronography: Hellanicus' Ἱερεῖαι', in N. Luraghi (ed.), 241–62.
- Momigliano, A. (1993) [1971] *The Development of Greek Biography* (Expanded edn.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Monoson, S.S. (2000) *Plato's Democratic Entanglements: Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

- Montanari, E. (1981) *Il Mito dell'Autoctonia: linee di una dinamica mitico-politica ateniese* (Roma: Bulzoni).
- Morgan, K.A. (1998) 'Designer History: Plato's Atlantis Story and Fourth-Century Ideology', *JHS*, 118, 101–18.
- . (ed.) (2003) *Popular Tyranny* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press).
- . (2010) 'Narrative Orders in the *Timaeus* and *Critias*', in R.D. Mohr and B.M. Sattler (eds.), 267–85.
- . (2012) 'Plato and the Stability of History', in J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones, and C. Maciver (eds.), *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History Without Historians* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 227–52.
- . (2015) *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Morrison, D.R. (1987) 'On Professor Vlastos' Xenophon', *AncPhil*, 7, 9–22.
- . (1994) 'Xenophon's Socrates as Teacher', in P.A. Vander Waerdt (ed.), 181–208.
- . (2004) 'Tyrannie et royauté selon le Socrate de Xénophon', *Études philosophiques*, 2, 177–92.
- Morrow, G.R. (1960) *Plato's Cretan City: A Historical Interpretation of the Laws* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Mossé, C. (1978) 'Le Thème de la *Patrios Politeia* dans la pensée grecque du IVème siècle', *Eirene*, 16, 81–9.
- Moyer, I.S. (2011) *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Mueller-Goldingen, C. (1995) *Untersuchungen zu Xenophons Kyrupädie* (Stuttgart: Teubner).
- Mulgan, R.G. (1974) 'A Note on Aristotle's Absolute Ruler', *Phronesis*, 19 (1), 66–9.
- Munson, R.V. (2001) *Telling Wonders: Ethnographic and Political Discourse in the Work of Herodotus* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).
- Muntz, C.E. (2011) 'The Invocation of Darius in Aeschylus' Persae', *CJ*, 106 (3), 257–71.
- Murray, O. (1971) 'Peri basileias: Studies in the Justification of Monarchic Power in the Hellenistic World', DPhil thesis (Oxford).
- . (2007) 'Philosophy and Monarchy in the Hellenistic World', in T. Rajak (ed.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press), 13–28.
- Nadon, C. (1996) 'From Republic to Empire: Political Revolution and the Common Good in Xenophon's *Education of Cyrus*', *American Political Science Review*, 90 (2), 361–74.
- . (2001) *Xenophon's Prince: Republic and Empire in the Cyropaedia* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- Nagle, D.B. (2000) 'Alexander and Aristotle's *Pambasileus*', *AC*, 69, 117–32.
- Naiden, F.S. (2006) *Ancient Supplication* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press).
- Nails, D. (2002) *The People of Plato: A Prosopography of Plato and Other Socratics* (Indianapolis: Hackett).
- Narcy, M. (1984) *Le Philosophe et son Double: un commentaire de l'Euthydème de Platon* (Paris: Vrin).
- . (1995) 'Le choix d'Aristippe (Xénophon, *Mémorables* II 1)', in G. Giannantoni (ed.), *La Tradizione socratica: seminario di studi* (Naples: Bibliopolis), 71–87.
- Natali, C. (1979–80) 'La struttura unitaria del I libro della *Politica* di Aristotele', *Polis*, 3 (1), 2–18.

- Navia, L.E. (2001) *Antisthenes of Athens: Setting the World Aright* (Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Press).
- Nawar, T. (2018) 'Thrasymachus' Unerring Skill and the Arguments of *Republic 1*', *Phronesis*, 63 (4), 359–91.
- Neils, J. (1987) *The Youthful Deeds of Theseus* (Roma: Bretschneider).
- Newell, W.R. (1983) 'Tyranny and the Science of Ruling in Xenophon's *Education of Cyrus*', *Journal of Politics*, 45 (4), 889–906.
- . (1987) 'Superlative Virtue: The Problem of Monarchy in Aristotle's *Politics*', *Western Political Quarterly*, 40 (1), 159–78.
- . (2013) *Tyranny: A New Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Newman, W.L. (1887) *The Politics of Aristotle*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Ney, H.-O. (2008) 'Y a-t-il un art de penser? la *techne* manquante de l'enseignement socratique dans les *Mémoires* de Xénophon', in M. Narcy and A. Tordesillas (eds.), *Xénophon et Socrate* (Paris: Vrin), 181–204.
- Nicolai, R. (2004) *Studi su Isocrate: la Comunicazione Letteraria nel IV Sec. a.C. e i nuovi Generi della Prosa* (Roma: Quasar).
- Nicolaïdou-Kyrianidou, V. (1998) 'Prodicos et Xénophon, ou le choix d'Heracles entre la tyrannie et la loyauté', in L.G. Mendōnē and A. Mazarakis Ainian (eds.), *Kea-Kythnos: historia kai archaiologia: praktika tou diethnous symposiou, Kea-Kythnos*, 22–25 Iouniou 1994 (Athens: Kentron Hellēnikēs kai Rōmaikēs Archaiotētōs), 81–98.
- Nightingale, A.W. (1995) *Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (1996) 'Plato on the Origins of Evil: The *Statesman* Myth Reconsidered', *AncPhil*, 16 (1), 65–91.
- . (1999) 'Historiography and Cosmology in Plato's *Laws*', *AncPhil*, 19, 299–326.
- Nippel, W. (2017) 'Zur Monarchie in der politischen Theorie des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.', in S. Rebenich and J. Wienand (eds.), *Monarchische Herrschaft im Altertum* (Berlin: De Gruyter), 245–61.
- Noël, M.-P. (2014) 'Εγκώμιον ou ἔπαινος? Définitions et usages de l'éloge dans l'Évagoras d'Isocrate et l'Agésilas de Xénophon', in P. Pontier (ed.), *Xénophon et la rhétorique* (Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne), 253–68.
- Norlin, G. and Van Hook, L.R. (1928–45) *Isocrates*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Novotny, J.R. and Jeffers, J. (2018) *The Royal Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal (668–631 BC), Assur-etal-ilani (630–627 BC), and Sin-sarra-iskun (626–612 BC), Kings of Assyria* (University Park: Eisenbrauns).
- Nozick, R. (1974) *Anarchy, State and Utopia* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- Nussbaum, M.C. (1990) 'Nature, Function and Capability: Aristotle on Political Distribution', in G. Patzig (ed.), 152–86.
- . (2000) 'Aristotle, Politics, and Human Capabilities: A Response to Antony, Arneson, Charlesworth, and Mulgan', *Ethics*, 111 (1), 102–40.
- Oakley, F. (2006) *Kingship: The Politics of Enchantment* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Ober, J. (1996) *The Athenian Revolution: Essays on Ancient Greek Democracy and Political Theory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- . (1998) *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens: Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- O'Connor-Visser, E.A.M.E. (1987) *Aspects of Human Sacrifice in the Tragedies of Euripides* (Amsterdam: Grüner).
- Ogden, D. (1997) *The Crooked Kings of Ancient Greece* (London: Duckworth).

- Ohnuki-Tierney, E. (2005) 'Japanese Monarchy', in D. Quigley (ed.), *The Character of Kingship* (Oxford: Berg), 209–32.
- Olson, K. (2016) *Imagined Sovereignties: The Power of the People and Other Myths of the Modern Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Olson, S.D. (1996) 'Politics and Poetry in Aristophanes' *Wasps*', *TAPA*, 126, 129–50.
- . (2007) *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- O'Meara, D.J. (2017) *Cosmology and Politics in Plato's Later Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Osaki, T. and Murakami, S. (2019) 'Reiwa: Japan Reveals Name of New Era Ahead of Emperor's Abdication', *Japan Times*, 01/04/2019. www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2019/04/01/national/politics-diplomacy/japan-readies-announce-name-new-era/#.XNRLWC-ZM0q.
- Osborne, C. (1996) 'Space, Time, Shape and Direction: Creative Discourse in the *Timaeus*', in C. Gill and M.M. McCabe (eds.), 179–211.
- . (1997) 'Heraclitus', in C.C.W. Taylor (ed.), *Routledge History of Philosophy: From the Beginning to Plato* (London: Routledge), 88–125.
- Osborne, R. (2003) 'Changing the Discourse', in K.A. Morgan (ed.), 251–72.
- . (2009) *Greece in the Making, 1200–479 B.C* (2nd edn.; London: Routledge).
- Owen, G.E.L. (1953) 'The Place of the *Timaeus* in Plato's Dialogues', *CQ*, 3 (1/2), 79–95.
- . (1973) 'Plato on the Undepictable', in E.N. Lee, A.P.D. Mourelatos, and R.M. Rorty (eds.), *Exegesis and Argument: Studies in Greek Philosophy Presented to Gregory Vlastos* (Assen: Van Gorcum), 349–61.
- Packard, J.M. (1988) *Sons of Heaven: A Portrait of the Japanese Monarchy* (London: Macdonald).
- Page, D.L. (1934) *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy: Studied With Special Reference to Euripides' Iphigeneia in Aulis* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Pangle, T.L. (1994) 'Socrates in the Context of Xenophon's Political Writings', in P.A. Vander Waerdt (ed.), 127–50.
- Papillon, T.L. (1996) 'Isocrates on Gorgias and Helen: The Unity of the *Helen*', *CJ*, 91 (4), 377–91.
- Parker, R. (1987) 'Myths of Early Athens', in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London: Croom Helm), 187–214.
- . (1996) *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- . (2007) *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Parker, V. (1998) 'Τύραννος. The Semantics of a Political Concept From Archilochus to Aristotle', *Hermes*, 126 (2), 145–72.
- Parmeggiani, G. (ed.) (2014) *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography* (Hellenic Studies; Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies).
- Parry, R.D. (2003) 'The Craft of Ruling in Plato's *Euthydemus* and *Republic*', *Phronesis*, 48 (1), 1–28.
- Partenie, C. (ed.) (2009) *Plato's Myths* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Patzner, A. (1970) *Antisthenes der Sokratiker: das literarische Werk und die Philosophie, dargestellt am Katalog der Schriften* (Heidelberg: Ruprecht-Karl-Universität zu Heidelberg).
- Patzig, G. (ed.) (1990) *Aristoteles' Politik: Akten Des XI Symposium Aristotelicum, Friedrichshafen-Bodensee, 25.8.-3.9.1987* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Payen, P. (1991) 'Franchir, transgresser, résister autour de Tomyris et Cyrus chez Hérodote', *Métis*, 6 (1–2), 253–81.

- Pelling, C.B.R. (1996) 'The Urine and the Vine: Astyages' Dreams at Herodotus 1.107–8', *CQ*, 46 (1), 68–77.
- . (ed.) (1997a) *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- . (1997b) 'Aeschylus' *Persae* and History', in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), 1–20.
- . (1999) "'Making Myth Look Like History": Plato in Plutarch's *Theseus-Romulus*', in A. Pérez Jiménez, J. García López, and R.M. Aguilar (eds.), *Plutarco, Platón y Aristóteles* (Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas), 431–43.
- . (2000) *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London: Routledge).
- . (2002a) 'Speech and Action: Herodotus' Debate on the Constitutions', *PCPhS*, 48, 123–58.
- . (2002b) *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales).
- . (2006) 'Educating Croesus: Talking and Learning in Herodotus' Lydian Logos', *ClAnt*, 25 (1), 141–77.
- . (2007) 'Aristagoras (5.49–55, 97)', in E. Irwin and E. Greenwood (eds.), *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 179–201.
- . (2009) 'Bringing Autochthony Up-to-Date: Herodotus and Thucydides', *CW*, 102 (4), 471–83.
- . (2016) 'Herodotus' Persian Stories: Narrative Shape and Historical Interpretation', *Syllecta Classica*, 27, 65–92.
- Pierris, A.L. (ed.) (2005) *The Empedoclean Κόσμος: Structure, Process and the Question of Cyclicity* (Patras: Institute for Philosophical Research).
- Podlecki, A.J. (1966) *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).
- . (1972) 'Politics in Aeschylus' *Supplices*', *Classical Folia*, 26, 64–71.
- . (1986) 'Polis and Monarch in Early Attic Tragedy', in J.P. Euben (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press), 76–100.
- . (1993) 'Κατ' ἀρχῆς γὰρ φιλαίτιος λεώς: The Concept of Leadership in Aeschylus', in A.H. Sommerstein et al. (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis* (Bari: Levante), 55–79.
- . (2004) 'Political and Other So-called Digressions in Euripides', in J.A. López Férez (ed.), *Tragedia Griega En Sus Textos* (Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas), 173–95.
- Pomeroy, S.B. (1994) *Xenophon, Oeconomicus: A Social and Historical Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Pontier, P. (2018) 'Praising the King's Courage: From the *Evagoras* to the *Agasilaus*', *Trends in Classics*, 10, 101.
- Pope, M. (1986) 'The Democratic Character of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*', in M. Cropp, E. Fantham, and S.E. Scully (eds.), *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy: Essays Presented to D. J. Conacher* (Calgary, Alberta: University of Calgary Press), 13–26.
- Popper, K.R. (1966) *The Open Society and its Enemies* (5th edn.; London: Routledge).
- Poulakos, J. (1986) 'Argument, Practicality, and Eloquence in Isocrates' *Helen*', *Rhetorica*, 4 (1), 1–19.
- Poulakos, T. (1987) 'Isocrates's Use of Narrative in the *Evagoras*. Epideictic Rhetoric and Moral Action', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 317–28.
- . (1997) *Speaking for the Polis: Isocrates' Rhetorical Education* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press).

- Pownall, F.S. (2004) *Lessons From the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).
- . (2007) 'From Orality to Literacy: The Moral Education of the Elite in Fourth-Century Athens', in C. Cooper (ed.), *Politics of Orality* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 6) (Leiden: Brill), 235–49.
- Pozzi, D.C. (1991) 'The Polis in Crisis', in D.C. Pozzi and J.M. Wickersham (eds.), *Myth and the Polis* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press), 126–63.
- Pradeau, J.-F. (1997) *Le Monde de la Politique: sur le récit atlante de Platon, Timée (17–27) et Critias* (Sankt Augustin: Academia).
- . (2002) *Plato and the City: A New Introduction to Plato's Political Thought*, trans. J. Lloyd (Exeter: University of Exeter Press).
- Prauscello, L. (2017) 'Plato Laws 3.680B – C: Antisthenes, The Cyclopes and Homeric Exegesis', *JHS*, 137, 8–23.
- Prince, S.H. (2015) *Antisthenes of Athens: Texts, Translations, and Commentary* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).
- Provencal, V. (2015) *Sophist Kings: Persians as Other in Herodotus* (London: Bloomsbury Academic).
- Quigley, D. (ed.) (2005) *The Character of Kingship* (Oxford; New York: Berg).
- Raaflaub, K.A. (2002) 'Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his Time', in E.J. Bakker, I.J.F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden: Brill), 149–86.
- . (2003) 'Stick and Glue: The Function of Tyranny in Fifth-century Athenian Democracy', in K.A. Morgan (ed.), 59–93.
- . (2010) 'Uterior Motives in Ancient Historiography: What Exactly, and Why?', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi (eds.), 189–210.
- Race, W.H. (1978) 'Panathenaicus 74–90: The Rhetoric of Isocrates' Digression on Agamemnon', *TAPA*, 108, 175–85.
- Rancière, J. (2001) 'Ten Theses on Politics', *Theory and Event*, 5 (3), np.
- . (2007) [1983] *Le Philosophe et ses Pauvres* (Paris: Flammarion).
- Rankin, H.D. (1986) *Ant[h]isthenes Sokratikos* (Amsterdam: Hakkert).
- Rappe, S. (2000) 'Father of the Dogs? Tracking the Cynics in Plato's *Euthydemus*', *CPh*, 95 (3), 282–303.
- Rashed, M. and Auffret, T. (2017) 'On the Inauthenticity of the *Critias*', *Phronesis*, 62 (3), 237–54.
- Rasmussen, P.J. (2009) *Excellence Unleashed: Machiavelli's Critique of Xenophon and the Moral Foundation of Politics* (Lanham, MD: Lexington).
- Rebenich, S. (ed.) (2017) *Monarchische Herrschaft im Altertum* (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Rebenich, S. and Wienand, J. (2017) 'Monarchische Herrschaft im Altertum: Zugänge und Perspektiven', in S. Rebenich (ed.), 1–20.
- Reinhardt, K. (1979) *Sophocles*, trans. H. Harvey and D. Harvey (Oxford).
- Reisert, J. (2009) 'Ambition and corruption in Xenophon's *Education of Cyrus*', *Polis*, 26 (2), 296–315.
- Rhodes, P.J. (1990) 'The Atthidographers', in H. Verdin, G. Schepens, and E. de Keyser (eds.), *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek Historiography From the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven, 24–26 May 1988* (Leuven: Kathol Universiteit), 73–81.
- . (1993) *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (2nd edn.; Oxford: Clarendon Press).

- . (2003) 'Nothing to Do With Democracy: Athenian Drama and the Polis', *JHS*, 123, 104–19.
- . (2010) 'Stability in the Athenian Democracy After 403 B.C', in B. Linke, M. Meier, and M. Strothmann (eds.), *Zwischen Monarchie und Republik: Gesellschaftliche Stabilisierungsleistungen und politische Transformationspotentiale in den antiken Stadtstaaten* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner), 67–75.
- . (2014) *Atthis: The Ancient Histories of Athens* (Heidelberg: Verlag Antike).
- Rhodes, P.J. and Osborne, R. (2003) *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404–323 BC* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Ricoeur, P. (1976) *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press).
- . (1984) *Time and Narrative*, trans. K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer, 3 vols. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- . (2003) *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language*, trans. R. Czerny, K. McLaughlin, and J. Costello (London: Routledge).
- Riesbeck, D.J. (2016) *Aristotle on Political Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Robinson, R. (1995) *Aristotle: Politics Books III & IV*, ed. D. Keyt (2nd edn.; Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Roisman, J. (1988) 'On Phrynichos' *Sack of Miletos* and *Phoinissai*', *Eranos*, 86, 15–23.
- Romer, F.E. (1982) 'The *Aisymneteia*: A Problem in Aristotle's Historic Method', *AJPhil*, 103 (1), 25–46.
- Roochnik, D.L. (1990) 'The Serious Play of Plato's *Euthydemus*', *Interpretation*, 18 (2), 211–32.
- . (1998) *Of Art and Wisdom: Plato's Understanding of Techne* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press).
- Rood, T. (forthcoming) 'From Ethnography to History: Herodotean and Thucydidean Traditions in the Development of Greek Historiography', in T. Harrison and J. Skinner (eds.), *Herodotus in the Nineteenth Century. Ethnography, Nationalism and Disciplinary Formation*.
- Rood, T., Attack, C., and Phillips, T. (forthcoming) *Anachronism and Antiquity* (London: Bloomsbury).
- Root, M.C. (1979) *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire* (Leiden: Brill).
- . (2013) 'Defining the Divine in Achaemenid Persian Kingship: The View From Bisitun', in C.P. Melville and L.G. Mitchell (eds.), 23–65.
- Rose, P.W. (2012) *Class in Archaic Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Rosivach, V.J. (1987) 'Autochthony and the Athenians', *CQ*, 37, 294–306.
- Ross, D. (1924) *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Roth, P. (2003) *Der Panathenaios des Isokrates: Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Munich: K.G. Saur).
- Rothwell, K.S. (1990) *Politics and Persuasion in Aristophanes' Ecclesiazusae* (Leiden: Brill).
- Rotstein, A. (2016) *Literary History in the Parian Marble* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Rowe, C.J. (1995) *Plato: Statesman* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips).
- . (1996) 'The *Politicus*: Structure and Form', in C. Gill and M.M. McCabe (eds.), 153–78.
- . (2000) 'The Peripatos After Aristotle', in C.J. Rowe and M. Schofield (eds.), 390–5.

- . (2010) 'On Grey-Haired Babies: Plato, Hesiod and Visions of the Past (and Future)', in G.R. Boys-Stones and J. Haubold (eds.), *Plato and Hesiod* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 298–316.
- Rowe, C.J. and Schofield, M. (eds.) (2000) *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Ruffell, I. (2000) 'The World Turned Upside Down: Utopia and Utopianism in the Fragments of Old Comedy', in F.D. Harvey and J. Wilkins (eds.), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy* (London: Duckworth), 473–506.
- Ruffy, M.V. (2004) 'Visualization and "Deixis am Phantasma" in Aeschylus' *Persae*', *QUCC*, 78 (3), 11–28.
- Sahlins, M. (2017a) 'The Original Political Society', in M. Sahlins and D. Graeber (eds.), 23–64.
- . (2017b) 'The Stranger-Kingship of the Mexica', in M. Sahlins and D. Graeber (eds.), 223–48.
- Sahlins, M. and Graeber, D. (2017) *On Kings* (Chicago, IL: HAU Press).
- Saïd, S. (2007) 'Tragedy and Reversal: The Example of the *Persians*', in M. Lloyd (ed.), *Aeschylus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 71–92.
- Salkever, S.G. (1990) *Finding the Mean: Theory and Practice in Aristotelian Political Philosophy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (1983) 'Exit Atossa: Images of Women in Greek Historiography on Persia', in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Images of Women in Antiquity* (London: Croom Helm), 20–33.
- . (1988) 'Was There Ever a Median Empire?', in A. Kuhrt and H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (eds.), *Method and Theory: Proceedings of the London 1985 Achaemenid History Workshop* (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten), 197–212.
- . (1993) 'Political Concepts in Old-Persian Royal Inscriptions', in K.A. Raaflaub (ed.), *Anfänge politischen Denkens in der Antike: die nahöstlichen Kulturen und die Griechen* (Munich: Oldenbourg), 145–64.
- Sanders, L.J. (1987) *Dionysius I of Syracuse and Greek Tyranny* (London: Croom Helm).
- Sandridge, N.B. (2012) *Loving Humanity, Learning, and Being Honored: The Foundations of Leadership in Xenophon's Education of Cyrus* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Saxonhouse, A.W. (2006) *Free Speech and Democracy in Ancient Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Schepens, G. (1977) 'Historiographical Problems in Ephorus', in T. Reekmans, E. Van 't Dack, and H. Verdin (eds.), *Historiographia Antiqua. Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae* (Leuven: Leuven University Press), 95–118.
- . (1997) 'Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Problems, Methods, Prospects', in G.W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments = Fragmente sammeln* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht), 144–72.
- . (2001) 'Ancient Greek Histories. Self-Definition Through History Writing', in K. Demoen (ed.), *The Greek City From Antiquity to the Present: Historical Reality, Ideological Construction, Literary Representation* (Leuven: Peeters), 3–25.
- Schmitt, C. (2005) [1985], *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. G. Schwab (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Schnepel, B. (1988) 'In Quest of Life: Hocart's Scheme of Evolution From Ritual Organization to Government', *European Journal of Sociology*, 29 (1), 165–87.
- Schofield, M. (1986) 'Euboulia in the *Iliad*', *CQ*, 36 (1), 6–31.

- . (1990) 'Ideology and Philosophy in Aristotle's Theory of Slavery', in G. Patzig (ed.), 1–27.
- . (1999a) *The Stoic Idea of the City* (2nd edn.; Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- . (1999b) *Saving the City: Philosopher-Kings and Other Classical Paradigms* (London: Routledge).
- . (2006) *Plato: Political Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- . (2009) 'Fraternité, inégalité, la parole de Dieu', in C. Partenie (ed.), 101–15.
- . (2010a) 'The *Laws*' Two Projects', in C. Bobonich (ed.), *Plato's Laws: A Critical Guide* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 12–28.
- . (ed.) (2010b) *Plato: Gorgias, Menexenus, Protagoras*, trans. T. Griffith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2012) 'Aristotle and the Democratization of Politics', in B. Morison and K. Ierodiakonou (eds.), *Episteme, Etc* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 285–301.
- . (2013) 'Friendship and Justice in the *Laws*', in G.R. Boys-Stones, D. El Murr, and C. Gill (eds.), *The Platonic Art of Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2019) 'Diakosmesis', in P.S. Horky (ed.), *Cosmos in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 62–73.
- Schöpsdau, K. (1994) *Nomoi = Gesetze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Schütrumpf, E. (1989) 'Review of Kamp, *Die politische Philosophie des Aristoteles und ihre metaphysischen Grundlagen*', *Gnomon*, 61 (4), 293–6.
- Schwartz, E. (1895) 'Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor, mit Excursen über die Interpolationen bei Africanus und Eusebios', *Abhandl., K. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, philol.-hist. Kl.*, 40, 1–94.
- Scubla, L. (2005) 'Sacred King, Sacrificial Victim, Surrogate Victim or Frazer, Hocart, Girard', in D. Quigley (ed.), 39–62.
- Seaford, R. (2000) 'The Social Function of Attic Tragedy: A Response to Jasper Griffin', *CQ*, 50 (1), 30–44.
- . (2003a) 'Tragic Tyranny', in K.A. Morgan (ed.), 95–115.
- . (2003b) 'Aeschylus and the Unity of Opposites', *JHS*, 123, 141–63.
- . (2004) *Money and the Early Greek Mind: Homer, Philosophy, Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2012) *Cosmology and the Polis: The Social Construction of Space and Time in the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Sedley, D.N. (2005) 'Empedocles' Life Cycles', in A.L. Pierris (ed.), 331–71.
- . (2009) 'Myth, Punishment and Politics in the *Gorgias*', in C. Partenie (ed.), 51–76.
- Sermamoglou-Soulmaidi, G. (2014) *Playful Philosophy and Serious Sophistry: A Reading of Plato's Euthydemus* (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Shear, J.L. (2011) *Polis and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Sidebottom, H. (2006) 'Dio Chrysostom and the Development of *On Kingship* Literature', in D. Spencer and E. Theodorakopoulos (eds.), *Advice and Its Rhetoric in Greece and Rome* (Bari: Levante), 117–57.
- Sidwell, K.C. (2009) *Aristophanes the Democrat: The Politics of Satirical Comedy During the Peloponnesian War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Sinclair, T.A. (1951) *A History of Greek Political Thought* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Skinner, J. (2012) *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

- Skinner, Q. (1996) *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Slater, N.W. (1996) 'Bringing Up Father: *paideia* and *ephebeia* in the *Wasps*', in A.H. Sommerstein and C. Atherton (eds.), *Education in Greek Fiction* (Bari: Levante), 27–52.
- . (1997) 'Performing the City in *Birds*', in G.W. Dobrov (ed.), 75–94.
- Smart, J.D. (1986) 'Thucydides and Hellanicus', in I.S. Moxon, J.D. Smart, and A.J. Woodman (eds.), *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 19–35.
- Snell, B., Kannicht, R., and Radt, S.L. (1971) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Solmsen, F. (1954) 'The "Gift" of Speech in Homer and Hesiod', *TAPA*, 85, 1–15.
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1987) *Aristophanes: Birds* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips).
- . (1997) 'The Theatre Audience, the Demos, and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus', in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), 63–79.
- Sørensen, A.D. (2016) *Plato on Democracy and Political Technē* (Leiden: Brill).
- . (2018) 'Political Office and the Rule of Law in Plato's *Statesman*', *Polis*, 35 (2), 401–17.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1991) *'Reading' Greek Culture: Texts and Images, Rituals and Myths* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Spalinger, A. (1976) 'Psammetichus, King of Egypt: I', *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*, 13, 133–47.
- Sprague, R.K. (1962) *Plato's Use of Fallacy: A Study of the Euthydemus and Some Other Dialogues* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).
- . (1976) *Plato's Philosopher-King: A Study of the Theoretical Background* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press).
- Stadter, P.A. (1991) 'Fictional Narrative in the *Cyropaideia*', *AJPh*, 112 (4), 461–91.
- Stalley, R.F. (ed.) (1995) *Aristotle: Politics*, trans. E.S. Barker (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- . (2007) 'The Politics of the *Gorgias*', in M. Erler and L. Brisson (eds.), *Gorgias – Menon: Selected Papers From the Seventh Symposium Platonicum* (Sankt Augustin: Academia), 116–21.
- Steinbock, B. (2011) 'A Lesson in Patriotism: Lycurgus' *Against Leocrates*, the Ideology of the *Ephebeia*, and Athenian Social Memory', *CLAnt*, 30 (2), 279–317.
- Steiner, D. (1994) *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Stoddard, K.B. (2003) 'The Programmatic Message of the "Kings and Singers" Passage: Hesiod, *Theogony* 80–103', *TAPA*, 133 (1), 1–16.
- Storey, I.C. (2003) *Eupolis, Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Strathern, A. (2019) *Unearthly Powers: Religious and Political Change in World History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Strauss, L. (1939) 'The Spirit of Sparta or the Taste of Xenophon', *Social Research*, 6 (4), 502–36.
- . (1972) *Xenophon's Socrates* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- . (2013) [1968], *On Tyranny*, Revised and Enlarged (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Stroheker, K.F. (1954) 'Zu den Anfängen der monarchischen Theorie in der Sophistik', *Historia*, 2 (4), 381–412.
- Sulek, A. (1989) 'The Experiment of Psammetichus: Fact, Fiction, and Model to Follow', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 50 (4), 645–51.

- Tamiolaki, M. (2012) 'Virtue and Leadership in Xenophon: Ideal Leaders or Ideal Losers?', in F. Hobden and C. Tuplin (eds.), *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry* (Leiden: Brill), 563–89.
- . (2014) 'Plato and Xenophon on Friendship. A Comparative Study (Plato *Lysis* and Xenophon *Conversations of Socrates* 2.6)', *CHS Research Bulletin*, 3 (1). <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hln:essay:TamiolakiM.Plato_and_Xenophon_on_Friendship_a_Comparative_Study.2014>, accessed 25/6/2016.
- Taplin, O. (1980) 'The Shield of Achilles Within the *Iliad*', *G&R*, 27 (1), 1–21.
- Tarrant, D. (1928) *The Hippias Major Attributed to Plato* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Tarrant, H. (2019) 'On Hastily Declaring Platonic Dialogues Spurious: The Case of *Critias*', *Méthexis*, 31 (1), 47–66.
- Tarrant, H., Benitez, E.E., and Roberts, T. (2011) 'The Mythical Voice in the *Timaeus-Critias*: Stylometric Indicators', *AncPhil*, 31 (1), 95–120.
- Tatum, J. (1989) *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Cyrus* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Taylor, C. (2004) *Modern Social Imaginaries* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press).
- Taylor, J. (2018) 'Knowledge: The Key to Assyrian Power', in G. Brereton (ed.), *I Am Ashurbanipal: King of the World, King of Assyria* (London: Thames and Hudson), 88–97.
- Thomas, R. (1989) *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2003) 'Prose Performance Texts: ἐπιδείξις and Written Publication in the Late Fifth and Early Fourth Centuries', in H. Yunis (ed.), *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 162–88.
- . (2012) 'Herodotus and Eastern Myths and Logoi', in E. Baragwanath and M. de Bakker (eds.), *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 233–53.
- . (2019) *Polis Histories, Collective Memories and the Greek World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Thompson, N. (1996) *Herodotus and the Origins of the Political Community: Arion's Leap* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- Thonemann, P. (2005) 'The Tragic King: Demetrios Poliorketes and the City of Athens', in O.J. Hekster and R. Fowler (eds.), 63–86.
- Too, Y.L. (1988) 'Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*: Disfiguring the Pedagogical State', in N. Livingstone and Y.L. Too (eds.), *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 282–302.
- . (1995) *The Rhetoric of Identity in Isocrates: Text, Power, Pedagogy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Török, L. (1992) 'Amasis and Ergamenes', in L. Kákossy and U. Luft (eds.), *The Intellectual Heritage of Egypt* (Studia Aegyptiaca; Budapest: Université Eötvös Loránd de Budapest), 555–61.
- Toye, D.L. (1995) 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the First Greek Historians', *AJPh*, 116 (2), 279–302.
- Trott, A.M. (2013) *Aristotle on the Nature of Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Tsouna-McKirahan, V. (1994) 'The Socratic Origins of the Cynics and the Cyrenaics', in P.A. Vander Waerdt (ed.), 367–91.
- Tudor, H. (1972) *Political Myth* (London: Pall Mall Press).

- Tully, J. (2014) 'Ephorus, Polybius, and τὰ καθόλου γράφειν', in G. Parmeggiani (ed.), 153–96.
- Tuplin, C.J. (1994) 'Xenophon, Sparta and the *Cyropaedia*', in A. Powell and S. Hodkinson (eds.), *The Shadow of Sparta* (London: Routledge), 127–64.
- . (1996) 'Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*: Education and Fiction', in A.H. Sommerstein and C. Atherton (eds.), *Education in Greek Fiction* (Bari: Levante), 65–162.
- . (2013) 'Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*: Fictive History, Political Analysis and Thinking with Iranian Kings', in C.P. Melville and L.M. Mitchell (eds.), 67–90.
- Vander Waerdt, P.A. (1985) 'Kingship and Philosophy in Aristotle's Best Regime', *Phronesis*, 30 (3), 249–73.
- . (ed.) (1994) *The Socratic Movement* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Van Harten, A. (2003) 'Creating Happiness: The Moral of the Myth of Kronos in Plato's *Laws* (*Laws* 4, 713b–714a)', in L. Brisson and S. Scolnicov (eds.), 128–38.
- Van Hook, L. (1945) *Isocrates*, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Vannicelli, P. (2001) 'Herodotus' Egypt and the Foundations of Universal History', in N. Luraghi (ed.), 211–40.
- Vasunia, P. (2001) *The Gift of the Nile: Hellenizing Egypt From Aeschylus to Alexander* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- Vernant, J.-P. (1971) 'Mètis et les mythes de souveraineté', *RHR*, 180, 29–76.
- . (1982) [1962] *The Origins of Greek Thought* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Vernant, J.-P. and Vidal-Naquet, P. (1988) *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*, trans. J. Lloyd (New York: Zone Books).
- Veyne, P. (1988) [1983] *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?*, trans. P. Wissing (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Vian, F. (1963) *Les Origines des Thèbes: Cadmos et les Spartes* (Paris: Klincksieck).
- Vickers, M.J. (1995) 'Alcibiades at Sparta: Aristophanes' *Birds*', *CQ*, 45 (2), 339–54.
- . (2008) *Sophocles and Alcibiades: Athenian Politics in Ancient Greek Literature* (Stocksfield: Acumen).
- Vidal-Naquet, P. (1964) 'Athènes et l'Atlantide. Structure et signification d'un mythe platonicien', *REG*, 77, 420–44.
- . (1986) *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World*, trans. A. Szegedy-Maszak (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- . (1995) [1990] *Politics Ancient and Modern*, trans. J. Lloyd (Cambridge: Polity).
- . (1996) 'Préface', in C. Calame (eds.), *Thésée et l'imaginaire athénien: légende et culte en Grèce antique* (2nd edn.; Lausanne: Editions Payot), 9–13.
- . (2002) 'Foreword: Castoriadis and the *Statesman*', in *On Plato's Statesman*, trans. D. Ames Curtis (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press), xiii–xviii.
- . (2005) *L'Atlantide: petite histoire d'un mythe platonicien* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Vlastos, G. (1947) 'Equality and Justice in Early Greek Cosmologies', *CPh*, 42 (3), 156–78.
- . (1983) 'The Historical Socrates and Athenian Democracy', *Political Theory*, 11 (4), 495–516.
- . (1994) *Socratic Studies*, ed. M. Burnyeat (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Walbank, W.F. (1984) 'Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas', in W.F. Walbank et al. (eds.), *The Hellenistic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 62–100.
- Waldron, J. (1995) 'The Wisdom of the Multitude: Some Reflections on Book 3, Chapter 11 of Aristotle's *Politics*', *Political Theory*, 23 (4), 563–84.

- Walker, H.J. (1994) *Theseus and Athens* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press).
- Ward, A. (2008) *Herodotus and the Philosophy of Empire* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press).
- Waters, K.H. (1972) 'Herodotos and Politics', *G&R*, 19 (2), 136–50.
- Weber, M. (1994) *Weber: Political Writings*, eds. P. Lassman and R. Speirs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2013) [1956] *Economy and Society*, eds. G. Roth and C. Wittich, trans. E. Fischhoff et al., 2 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Węcowski, M. (2012) 'Hippias of Elis (6)', in I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby*, np.
- Weil, R. (1959) *L'Archéologie de Platon* (Paris: C. Klincksieck).
- White, D.A. (2007) *Myth, Metaphysics and Dialectic in Plato's Statesman* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- White, H.V. (1975) *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- . (1978) *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press).
- Whitman, C.H. (1964) *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Wiesehöfer, J. (2004) 'Daiukku, Deiokes und die medische Reichsbildung', in M. Meier et al. (eds.), *Deiokes, König der Meder: eine Herodot-Episode in ihren Kontexten* (Oriens et Occidens; Stuttgart: Steiner), 15–26.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von (1893) *Aristoteles Und Athen*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Will, E. (1972) *Le Monde Grec et l'Orient: Vol. 1, Le Ve siècle (510–403)* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France).
- Wilson, J.P. (1997) *The Hero and the City: An Interpretation of Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).
- Wilson, P. (2000) *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City, and the Stage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- . (2009) 'Tragic Honours and Democracy: Neglected Evidence for the Politics of the Athenian Dionysia', *CQ*, 59 (1), 8–29.
- Wood, N. (1964) 'Xenophon's Theory of Leadership', *C&M*, 25, 33–66.
- Woodruff, P. (1982) *Plato: Hippias Major* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Zajonz, S. (2002) *Isokrates' Enkomion Auf Helena: Ein Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Zannini Quirini, B. (1987) *Nephelokokkygia: la prospettiva mitica degli Uccelli di Aristofane* (Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider).
- Zuntz, G. (1963) *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Zuolo, F. (2017) 'Constituting the Political Age in Plato's *Statesman*: New Categories for an Old Question', *History of Political Thought*, 38 (2), 195–212.

Index of passages cited

- Aeschines
 On the Embassy
 31 70
Aeschines of Sphettus
 Fr. 49–50 93
 Fr. 70 93
Aeschylus
 Persians
 40 43
 42 43
 56 63n37
 199 44
 213 42
 235 43
 241–4 43
 249 36n81
 468 44
 633 43
 730 43
 759–86 43
 762–4 42
 828 62n33
 833–4 44
 855–6 43
 1000 43
 1017 44
 1030 44
 [*Prometheus Bound*]
 9 193n20
 Suppliant Women
 222 45
 345 121n127
 365–6 45
 368–9 46
 373–5 46, 48
 437 47
 488 64n77
 524–6 47
 604 45
 698–700 45–6
 1062 47
Anonymus Iamblichi
 6.1 100
 7.1–7 100
 7.14–15 182
 8.12 100
Antisthenes
 Fr. 8 94
 Fr. 53–4 90n92
 Fr. 71 95
 Fr. 86–7 95
 Fr. 96 97
 Fr. 97 94
 Fr. 98 96
 Fr. 99 95, 97
 Fr. 134 95, 99
 Fr. 141 95
 Fr. 186 96
 Fr. 189 96
 Fr. 203 95
 Fr. 204 95
Archilochus
 Fr. 19 West 17
Aristophanes
 Acharnians
 19 195n44
 61–5 66n127
 Assemblywomen
 583–688 58
 Birds
 27–38 59
 42–5 60
 109–10 59
 114–6 59
 122–6 59
 465–523 60, 66n143
 685–736 60
 753–69 60

- 812–4 59
 1280–5 59
 1537–41 67n162
 1583–5 59
 1673 61
 1706–65 59, 61
Clouds
 356–7 181
Knights
 1015–30 53
Lysistrata
 567–86 159
Thesmophoriazusae
 140 63n59
Wasps
 411 57
 417 57
 463–5 57
 473 57
 515–9 57
 548–9 55–6
 555 57
 619–27 56, 57
 733 58
 1474–575 58
 Aristotle
On Kingship
 Fr. 647 192n5
Nicomachean Ethics
 8.7.1158b29–1159a12 188
 8.9.1159b31 188
 8.11.1161a11–14 142
Politics
 1.2.1252b15–27 182
 1.2.1252b19–20 10
 1.2.1253a1–29
 188, 189, 194n37
 1.2.1253a30–1 182
 1.12.1259b6–9 37n108, 191
 3.3.1276a22–30 36n85
 3.4.1277a24 192n6
 3.7.1279a22–b11 33n18
 3.11.1281a42–b10 180, 183, 186, 188
 3.13.1284a3–17 104, 183, 187, 189
 3.13.1284a26–30 189
 3.14.1285a3–16 184
 3.14.1285a16–29 184
 3.14.1285a29–b1 184
 3.14.1285b3–20 184, 195n57
 3.14.1285b29–33 184
 3.15.1286a31–b2 186
 3.15.1286b38–9 185
 3.15.1286a1–2 182
 3.15.1286a21–5 185
 3.15.1286a31–3 186
 3.15.1286b8–13 187
 3.15.1286b22–7 187
 3.15.1286b27–40 187
 3.16.1287a1–2 182, 186–7
 3.16.1287a10–11 187
 3.16.1287a32 187
 3.16.1287b25–35 26, 126, 188
 3.17.1288a3 167
 3.17.1288a15–19 189
 3.17.1288a23–9 184, 189, 190
 5.10.1312a9–14 147n60
 5.10.1310b31–40 181
 5.11.1314a29–15a24 124
 7.4.1326a22–30 36n88
 Rhetoric
 1.7.1365b7–1366a1 193n20
 [*Ath. Pol./Constitution of the Athenians*]
 3.2–5 3, 10, 64n81, 65n98
 7.1 176n55
 41 80, 81
 47.4 10
 57 10
 Ashurbanipal
 Assyrian Tablet 002.i.13–18 35n48
 Cicero
Republic
 2.1–31 11
 Ctesias
 F13 35n64
 Darius
DB 68 35n64
DNb 1, 2f 19
 Demon (FGrH 327)
 F5 76
 Demosthenes
 1.4 146n31
 [59].74–6 70, 77
 [60].27–31 62n4
 Diogenes Laertius
Lives of the Philosophers
 8.57 21
 8.64–6 21
 9.1.6 18
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus
On Thucydides
 9 70, 87n10
 Empedocles
 B8 35n54
 B9 35n54
 B17 21, 35n56, 175n27

- B20 35n57
 B115 35n54
 Ephorus (*FGrH* 70)
 F9 75, 177n75
 F148 177n89
 Euripides
 Children of Heracles/Heracleidae
 403–18 53
 418–9 45
 476–83 54
 826–7 53
 Erechtheus
 Fr. 360N 54
 F. 362N 54
 Heracles
 1163–71 39, 65n108
 1221–2 39
 1334–6 39
 Suppliant Women/Supplices
 113–4 48
 166 48
 244–5 49
 255 48
 341 49
 350–5 48–9, 64n77
 384 48
 430–2 49
 442–56 48, 65n117
 513 48
 727 47
 Hellanicus (*FGrH* 323a)
 F6 88n32
 F23 73
 Heraclides
 Epitome of the Athenian Constitution
 1 74
 Heraclitus
 B9 37n109
 B32 18
 B49 22
 B51 29
 B52 18
 B53 18
 B90 29
 B96 30
 B114 18
 Herodotus
 1.proem 154
 1.5.3–4 20, 23
 1.6–94 14, 23
 1.7.2–3 34n27
 1.7.8–12.2 19
 1.12.2–13.2 17
 1.30.1 30
 1.32.2–4 27
 1.46–54 19, 30
 1.59.6 17
 1.65.2–66.1 19
 1.65.3–4 25
 1.87.3 149n97
 1.88–90 140
 1.95–101 23–26, 142
 1.96.1 17, 24
 1.96.2 34n28
 1.97–8 17
 1.97.2–3 15, 24, 90n86
 1.98.3–6 25
 1.99–130 21
 1.99.2 26
 1.100.2 126, 195n63
 1.101 26
 1.102 21, 26
 1.106.1 26
 1.131 134
 1.205–6 20
 1.207 20, 37n96, 140
 2.2 19, 27
 2.121 36n75
 2.142.2 20
 2.142.3 163
 2.144 27
 2.147–82 26–8
 2.147.1–2 27
 2.147.4 27–8
 2.148.1–7 28, 113
 2.151–2 28
 2.161.1–2 28
 2.162.2 29
 2.172–3 29, 191
 2.174 30, 32
 2.177.2 30
 2.178.1 30
 3.16 30
 3.31.4–5 19
 3.38.5 19, 30
 3.40 32
 3.42.2 34n25
 3.52.4 16, 34n25
 3.53.4 16
 3.80.2–6 15–16, 21, 38n128
 3.82.1–5 13, 16, 22
 3.82.5 22, 23
 3.84.2–3 26, 188
 3.122 177n70
 3.125.4 32, 38n125
 3.142–9 32
 4.5 31

- 4.78–80 30
 4.150–9 18
 5.44 16
 5.51 20
 5.76 20, 70
 5.78 15, 24, 35n45
 5.92 19, 34n25, 147n40, 189, 196n71
 5.97 20, 22, 35n45, 194n34
 6.51 38n121
 6.57 17, 18
 7.3 31
 7.34 17
 7.136.1 18
 7.143.3 25
 7.161.1 34n25
 7.204 31
 8.44.2 70
 8.52–5 70
 8.131.2 31
 8.137–8 31
 9.73.2 70
 9.97 87n12
- Hesiod
- Theogony*
- 84–92 8, 65n123, 196n77
- Works and Days*
- 38–9 8
 53–82 193n16
 221 8
 225–37 12
 256–73 8–9
 261–5 36n70
- Homer
- Iliad*
- 2.100–9 64n65
 8.539 174n25
 12.323 174n25
 18.550 8
- Odyssey*
- 5.218 174n25
 11.568 120n0104
 19.109–14 8, 191
 19.386–475 121n122
 21.10–12 37n113
- Isocrates
- Antidosis*
- 73 146n13
 84 123
- Archidamus*
- 16–21 129, 178n94
- Areopagiticus*
- 14 90n84
 16–18 75
 21–2 127
- Busiris*
- 15–23 174n14
- Evagoras*
- 5–7 75, 132
 8 132
 10 132
 12–20 129, 133
 19 130, 134
 21 133
 25–6 133–4
 31 134
 37–9 133–4
 47 133
 51 134
 65–9 75, 133
 71–2 134
- Helen*
- 1 78, 79, 120n109
 11 79
 14–15 78
 22 78
 24–5 78–80
 29 79–80
 31 79–81
 33–4 80–1
 35 81
 36 78, 79, 81
 37 127
- Nicocles*
- 5–9 125
 10–11 125
 14 125–6
 15 126
 16 126–7
 17–21 127
 21 126
 22–4 128
 26 128
 28 129
 29–30 129
 33 129
 35 129
 36–7 124, 130
 39 130
 41 130
 43 124, 130
 44 131
 48 131
 57 131
 63 131
 77 132
- Panathenaicus*
- 72–83 83
 125 83
 126–7 77, 83

- 127–9 82–3
 138–48 83–4
 153–4 84
Panegyricus
 8 74, 132
 9 74
 21–7 69
 28 157
 54–8 79
 68 79
 71 79
To Philip
 114 174n7
 119–20 193n7
 128–31 70
 Kleidemos (*FGrH* 323)
 F17 68, 86n1
 Lycurgus
Against Leocrates
 85–8 85–6, 91n105
 98 85–6
 100 52
 Lysias
 2.3–16 74
 2.17–19 89n75
 Parian Marble (*FGrH* 239)
 1–2 177n77
 20 37n101
 Philochorus (*FGrH* 328)
 F2 37n101
 F17a 76
 F94 37n101, 177n80
 Pindar
 Fr. 169 11, 19, 181
 Plato
Critias
 106b4–108a4 164–5
 108c5–110c2 164
 108c7–d2 176n66
 109b1–2 165
 109c4–d1 165
 110a7–b2 165
 115c4–117d5 36n83
 119c1–120d5 165
 121a8–b7 158, 166
Euthydemus
 285d 111
 288d8 112
 290ab 112
 290e 111, 112–3
 291a 113
 291c–292d 113–4
 292e–293a 114
 293a 111
 297b10–c5 89n69, 113
 304d–305b 114
Gorgias
 455e 108
 464b 108
 469c1–2 119n67
 484b1–c3 181
 470ce 107–8
 518a 108
 518e–519d 107
 521d6–8 108
 522bc 109
 523a–526c 109
 526c 109
Hippias Major
 285d6–286a2 75, 88n47
Laws
 1.624a1–6 166
 1.631c5–d1 90n89
 2.656d–657c 171
 3.676bc 167
 3.677a 167
 3.678a–680e 168
 3.686b–89a 168
 3.690ac 168
 3.690d 168
 3.690e–691a 169
 3.691cd 169, 195n52
 3.692a6–b4 169
 3.695a 170, 172
 3.695de 170
 3.697c–698a 170
 3.700a–701d 167
 3.701a 170
 4.702bd 166
 4.710de 171
 4.712e–713b 171
 4.713a2–714b1 166–7, 172,
 195n55
 5.739ad 166
 10.904a 171–2
 10.906ac 172
Menexenus
 237a4–c4 157
 237e1–2 157
 238d 157
 239b5–6 64n66
Phaedo
 58a10–c5 10
 59b 116n12
 82a4–6 12
 110b–111e 36n82
 107d–115a 109

Philebus

28c7–8 178n109

Protagoras

320c–322d 108

323ac 130

343a2 194n41

Republic

1.330d2 90n90

1.336a5–7 93

1.345bc 153

1.346cd 153

1.347be 153

2.379e3–380a5 165

2.359c–360c 147n40

2.364e3–365a3 193n14

3.414de 53

3.415d4 172

4.428d6 111

4.432b8–d4 121n122, 148n73

4.433ae 36n73

4.438e 111

5.464e1 186

5.473cd 92, 107, 111, 114, 119n77

6.485ce 109

6.486a8–10 109, 114

6.493ad 146n29

6.500bd 114

6.502a4–c7 107

7.519d–520a 153

8.544c6 90n76

8.554d9 186

8.563c6 120n98

10.614b–621b 109

Statesman

258b2–3 152

258e8–11 153

259d4–5 152, 153

262a 154

267ac 153

268d 154

268e 155

269bc 155

271c3–8 155–6

271e 157

271e7–8 151, 156

272a 157

272bd 155, 157–8

272d–273a 156–7

273b 158

273e 155, 157

274de 157

275b9–c4 156

277a 159

277bc 154

279b 159

286e1 181

289cd 159

290a4–6 159

290de 159

291d–292b 33n18, 160

292a1–3 160

292d 160

292e6–9 34n36

293de 159, 161

294a6–8 160, 185

297de 161

298ad 161

299e 161

300d9 153

300e–301a 154, 161, 185

301ab 162

301b1 153

301d9–e4 161, 174n22

304cd 162

Symposium

208d4–5b 85

Timaeus

22a5 164

22a7–b3 164

26e4–5 181

29b3–d3 165

45e–46a 165

55c4–6 37n101

Plutarch

Life of Theseus

1.3 70

19.4–6 68

24.2 81

29.3 68

29.4–5 47, 68

32.1–2 89n59, 189

36.1 89n53

[Lives of the Ten Orators]

837e 90n96

Sophocles

Oedipus at Colonus

54–5 50

66–9 50–51

78 51

229–36 51

551–68 51

569–74 51

1040–41 193n22

1095 51

1287 51

- 1526–32 52
 1759 51
Oedipus Tyrannos
 62–4 47
- Theophrastus
Characters
 26.6–7 77
- Thucydides
 1.1.3 74
 1.91 90n92
 1.10.2 36n79
 1.20.1 74
 1.20.3 39
 1.22 74, 177n75
 2.15 36n79, 76, 82, 172
 2.35.1–2 132
 2.37–46 74, 194n33
 5.20.2 87n24
 6.24 64n93
 6.53.3–59.4 39
 7.69.2 74, 88n38
 7.77.7 25
 8.1 50
 8.67.2 50
- Xenophon
Agesilaus
 1.1 132
 7.1 133
 9.1–3 150n116
 10.2 133
Anabasis
 1.9.13 148n66
Cyropaedia
 1.1.2 138, 153
 1.1.3–5 135, 137, 144, 154
 1.1.6 135, 137
 1.2.2–16 136
 1.3.15–18 137
 1.4.3–4 136–7
 1.4.27–8 149n90
 1.6.1 138
 1.6.2–6 138
 1.6.21–2 138
 1.6.44–6 138
 3.1.14 148n73
 4.1.10–14 139
 4.1.24 140
 5.1.2–9 141
 5.1.24 174n22
 5.5.5–43 139–41
 6.1.32 141
- 7.2.9–29 140
 7.3.16 141
 7.5.37 141–2, 154
 7.5.58–68 188
 7.5.72–85 143
 8.1.16 143
 8.1.21 143
 8.1.22 100, 144
 8.1.23–4 142
 8.1.39 142
 8.1.40 145
 8.2.4–6 144
 8.2.10–12 126, 144,
 196n64
 8.2.13–14 142
 8.2.14 122, 138, 153
 8.2.27 143
 8.2.42–7 142–3
 8.2.54–6 143
 8.3.13 143
 8.3.25 149n97
 8.5 187
 8.8.1–27 170
- Hellenica*
 6.4.28 180
- Hiero*
 3.1–6 188
 5.1–2 188
 6.1–2 188
 6.9–11 188
 8.5 139
 10.1–3 188
- Memorabilia*
 1.2.64 100
 1.5.4 103
 1.6.2 90n90
 2.1.1 101
 2.1.2–5 101
 2.1.9 102
 2.1.10–17 98, 101–3
 2.1.12 119n67
 2.1.16 98
 2.1.17 94, 101
 2.1.21–34 94, 96, 103
 2.4.7 141
 3.2.1–2 36n73
 3.5 84–5
 3.5.9 177n75
 3.5.10 99
 3.9.10–11 99
 4.1.1 119n76
 4.2.11 94, 98, 100, 103–4
 4.2.12 104

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| 4.2.31–5 119n74 | 4.20–5 105, 148n66 |
| 4.2.35–6 104 | 13.4–5 105 |
| 4.2.40 104 | 14.6–7 99, 105–6 |
| 4.6.12 99, 184 | 21.10–11 99, 106 |
| 4.8.11 117n24 | <i>Symposium</i> |
| <i>Oeconomicus</i> | 2.6 117n24 |
| 1.22–3 120n98 | 3.5–6 96, 116n10 |
| 4.4 105 | 4.6 90n92, 96, 98 |

General index

- absolute monarchy 26, 46–7, 92, 169, 181
Achaemenid empire 5, 13–38, 41–4, 92,
101, 107–8, 136–44
Aeschines 70
Aeschines of Sphettus 93
Aeschylus 113; *Persians* 39, 41–4;
Suppliant Women 41, 44–7
Agamemnon 41, 64n65, 96, 98, 122
Agesilaus 132–3, 134, 150n116, 166
Alcibiades 92–3, 95–6
Alexander III of Macedon ('the Great') 180
Amasis 28–30, 32, 191
Amazons 79
anachronism 8, 39–40, 61n3
ancestral constitution *see patrios politeia*
Anonymus Iamblichi 93, 99–100, 182
Antisthenes 92, 94–7, 99, 114, 168;
reception of 116n16
Apollo 53, 65n124
Archelaus of Macedon 92–3, 95, 108–10,
147n41
Argos 45–7
Aristippus of Cyrene 99
Aristophanes 55–61; *Birds* 56, 58–61,
67n159, 67n162; *Clouds* 57, 181; *Frogs*
64n87; *Knights* 53, 64n90; *Lysistrata*
159; *Wasps* 56–8
Aristotle 3, 9, 37n116, 179–96; *Ath. Pol.*
93; *Nicomachean Ethics* 188; *Politics*
179–96; wisdom of the multitude
127, 186
Ashurbanipal 19
Astyages 21, 26, 136–7
Athens 25; City Dionysia 39–40, 49;
democracy 2–6, 15, 39–40, 47–52, 55–
7, 60, 75–7, 93, 99, 107, 131, 169–71,
183–4; drama 39–67; history 68–86;
kings 9, 47–52, 68–86; synoecism 9, 48,
51–2, 72, 76, 172, 189; tyrants 17, 57–8
Atlantis 162–6
Atthidography 68–9, 71–4, 76
autochthony 43, 52–5, 65n101, 157, 162
Axial Age 1–2, 14, 33n5, 92

basileus archon 3, 52, 70, 159–60
basilike techne 92–121, 151–2
building projects 25, 32, 113, 141

Cambyses 30, 138–9
Candaules 16–17, 19
Cassirer, Ernst 7
Castoriadis, Cornelius 2, 40
Cecrops 76, 81, 84–5, 165
Cicero 7
citizens: as kings 55–8, 105; as 'slaves'
57–8, 101–2
Cleisthenes 9, 86
Codrus 9, 69–71, 73, 85
comedy 40, 55–61, 96
constitutions: ancestral (*see patrios*
politeia); aristocracy 81, 170;
democracy 146n29, 170; mixed 81, 144;
monarchy 1, 125–6, 134, 144; oligarchy
77; republican 180
cosmic order 2, 6–9, 13–38, 41–2, 44,
55–61, 122, 151; cycles of 154–8; virtue
and 143, 190
court protocol 25–6, 137, 141–4
craft analogy 107–9, 158–60
Crete 76, 113, 166–72
Croesus 14, 19, 21, 27, 140
Cronus: Age of 109–10, 152–62
custom *see nomos*
Cyaxares 136
cyclicity: cosmic 152–62; political
15–16, 20–21, 26, 129, 167, 175n28
Cynics 95–7
Cyprus 123–32

- Cyrus the Great 23, 94–6, 134–44, 147n60, 161, 166, 169–71, 187; contrasted with Evagoras 133–4
 Cyrus the Younger 105
- Danaus 45–8
 Darius 13–14, 19, 22–3, 41–4, 170, 187
 Deioces 17, 21, 23–6, 95, 136, 144, 156, 187–8; historicity of 35n64
 democracy 45–7, 76–7, 127, 185–6
 demos 25, 49, 53, 108
 Demosthenes 146n31
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus 70
 Dionysius II of Syracuse 180
 Dionysus 58
 discourse 3, 135
 drama 39–67, 170
- Ecbatana 25
 education 56–7, 75, 99, 101–3, 132, 137–8, 153, 170; mimesis in 123; Socratic 112–3, 123
 Egypt 2, 14–15, 26–32, 70, 163; historical cycles of 20, 156; religion 27–8, 30; Royal labyrinth 113
 Eleatic Stranger [Ch 6], 182–3
 Empedocles 20–1, 155, 175n28
 empire 14, 21, 23–6, 122–3, 134–6, 142–4, 172, 187
enkrateia 101–3, 130, 139, 141
 Ephorus 71, 75
 epistemic status: of kings 20–1, 22, 28
 equality 7, 40, 53, 81, 115, 137, 154, 183, 188; proportionate/geometric 122, 125–7, 139–41, 190; status 142–3
 Erechtheus 4, 39–40, 52–5, 69, 84, 86, 165
 Erichthonius 84, 165
ethnos states 15, 69, 70, 101, 115, 122, 180; despotic template and 131, 136–7
eudaimonia 102–3, 112, 129–30, 140–1, 190; equality and 142–3; generated by kings 122, 131, 153–4
 Euripides: *Children of Heracles/Heracleidae* 44–5, 53–4, 89n73; *Erechtheus* 9, 39, 52–5; *Heracles* 40; *Ion* 52, 62n11; *Suppliant Women* 44–7, 69
 Evagoras of Salamis 93, 123, 132–4, 148n61
 exemplarity 86, 122, 124–5, 162; king as exemplar 124, 130–1, 142–3, 145, 171, 197; limits of mythical 132; non-Greek examples 123
- Foucault, Michel 3
 foundation myths 7, 9, 31, 52–3, 59, 68–74, 76, 83, 129, 132, 151, 156–7, 181, 189
 freedom 13, 15, 23–4, 26–7, 82, 102, 170
 friendship 141–4
- genealogy 128, 132, 140, 164
 gold 29–30
 golden age 55, 60, 96, 152–62; Age of Cronus 109–10, 166–7, 171–3
 Gorgo 20
 greed *see pleonexia*
- Helen 70, 78–9
 Hellenicus 70–3
 Heracles 40, 73, 79–80; *Choice of Heracles* 94, 96, 103; In Socratic thought 92, 94, 96–7, 113
 Heraclids 44, 53–4, 79, 167–8
 Heraclitus 17–19, 29
 Herodotus 5, 59, 70–1, 82, 95, 113, 140, 154; debate of constitutions 13–14, 21–3; Deioces in 156, 160, 197–8; democracy and 183; kingship in 13–38; model of empire 136
 Hesiod 8–9, 42, 55, 60
 historiography: *akribeia* 75, 84, 165; Athenian [Ch3] 162–6; intentional history 71–2; local 70–1; periodisation 71–2; synchronism 70–4
 Hobbes, Thomas 33–4n18, 182, 189, 191
 Homer 8, 168; heroes in 96, 171, 191; kingship in 47–8, 94
 household 96, 104–6; analogy with polis 93; early form of society 96
- imaginary, political 2, 40, 55, 69, 170; kings in 131, 188–91
 imitation *see mimesis*
 Isocrates 4–5, 69–70, 74–6, 89n63, 131; *Busiris* 174n14; *Evagoras* 123, 132–4; *Helen* 77–82, 123; *Nicocles* 123–31, 142; *Panegyricus* 74–5, 78; *Panathenaicus* 77, 82–4, 124
- Jason of Phrae 180
 judgement 8–9, 20, 23–5, 81, 95, 127, 160, 183; in underworld 109–10, 116
 justice 8, 23–5, 42, 84, 96, 99, 109–10, 125–6, 137, 184; distributive 129, 139–40, 143–4

- kairos* 127, 135, 142–3, 158, 161–2
king lists 72–4, 158
kings: absolute 26, 46–7, 92, 169, 181;
agents of cosmic order 9, 13–38, 63n43,
72, 181–3; democratic 39–41, 45–52;
divine 15, 43, 140, 172; epistemic
status of 19–20, 22, 28, 44, 51, 99–100,
125; as generals 51, 76–7, 81–2,
128, 137–8, 184; heroic 14, 47, 72,
94, 101, 184; mildness 127, 146n28;
philosophers 52, 82, 107, 92, 114–5;
priests 17, 159–60, 184; shepherd 43,
122, 138, 151–4, 158, 168, 172; virtue
80, 93, 105–6, 122–150
Kleidemos 68, 86n1
knowledge 19–20, 44, 51, 99, 126, 142;
basilike technē and 111, 152–3; of the
divine 138; in Plato 114, 151; royal
women and 20; virtue and 123
- law 99, 186–7; *basilikoi nomoi* 105–6,
109; rulers and 137, 144; virtue and 99
lawgivers 60, 156, 161, 171, 185–6
Lycurgus (of Athens) 5–6, 52–3, 70, 173;
Against Leocrates 85–6
Lycurgus (of Sparta) 25–6, 186
Lysias 74, 89n75
- Macedon 31, 68, 180, 192n5
Maeandrius 32, 38nn127–8
Marmor Parium 73, 77
Medes 23–6, 134–44
metaphysics: of monarchy 41–3, 93, 100,
179–83
mētis 24–5
mimesis 123–4, 131, 142–5, 152, 158–60,
171, 185, 197
‘Mirror for Princes’ 123
myth 40; Athenian 55; eschatological
107–10; foundation 68–72, 151;
political 5–7, 14, 55; retelling 40, 59,
103, 124, 162; temporality of 151–62
- nomos* 17–19, 23, 29–30
- Odysseus 25, 29
Oedipus 46, 49–52
ontology: man, beast, god division 154,
190; political 2, 46, 93, 105, 125, 135,
179–83
oracles 18, 19, 30
orientalism 137, 148n67
Otanes 13–14, 15, 21–2
- palaces: Babylon 142, 145; Ecbatana 25–6;
London 36n87; Tokyo 36n87
Pantheia 141, 181
paradeigma *see* exemplarity
patrios politeia 21, 75, 84, 93, 106, 127,
157, 161–4, 166, 169–70, 176nn54–5
peisistratus 17
Pelagus 41, 45–7
Peloponnesian War 85, 92; and drama
47–8, 49–50, 56; and myth 73, 163;
Sicilian expedition 59
Periander 16
Pericles 47–8, 49, 57, 76, 83, 92, 108
Persia 2, 13–14, 21–2, 41–4, 105–6; Great
king as exemplar 108–9, 122, 124;
religion in 63n43; in Xenophon 134–44
Persian Wars 167
Philip II of Macedon 69, 82–4, 124,
174n7, 180
philosopher kings 52, 82
Pindar 59, 62n29, 181
Plato 73, 75, 135; *Critias* 162–6;
Euthydemus 98, 111–15, 153, 159;
Gorgias 107–10, 181; *Laws* 75, 96,
[Ch6] 181, 186; *Menexenus* 157, 163;
Phaedo 113; *Republic* 53, 96–7, 114–5,
147n40, 151, 153, 159; *Statesman*
96, 99, 151–62, 183–6, 190; *Timaeus*
162–6
pleonexia 17, 49, 129–30, 140
Plutarch 47, 68, 70
polis: community 45–6, 102–6; kingship in
30–2, 123–32, 144–5, 179–92; as singular
entity 46, 48–9; on stage 40–1, 44–52
political: entities (*see ethnos* state; polis);
imaginary (*see* imaginary, political);
myth (*see* myth, political)
- Polycrates 32
Poseidon 54, 65n124, 165
power 42, 45–7, 169; feminisation and 139
Praxithea 54–5, 86, 177n79
priesthood 17, 32, 159–60
Prodicus 94, 96
Psammetichus 19, 26–8, 156, 187
power 104
- queens *see* women
- rhetoric 74–6, 77; battle speech 53;
encomium 132; funeral speech 90n101,
132, 157, 163; protreptic 112, 132
Ricoeur, Paul 8; ‘surplus of meaning’ 8,
101, 128

Salamis (Cyprus) 123–32

Samos 32

Scythia 31

seclusion 143

sex: absent from golden age 156–7;
continence 130; sexual assault 141, 165;
tyrannical impropriety 147n40

slavery 57, 101–2, 186, 191

Socrates 4, 84, 92–121, 141, 181; and the
divine 113; as fictive character 117n37;
use of craft analogy 107–9; use of
protreptic 117n24

Solon 21, 27, 30, 82, 161, 164, 170

Sophocles 39, 50, 64n87; *Antigone* 39;
Oedipus at Colonus 39, 44, 49–52;
Oedipus Tyrannos 41, 46–7

sōphrosunē 80–3, 97, 102, 129–30

sovereignty 182, 195n44

Sparta 59, 169, 195n53; invading Athens
70–1, 75; dual kingship 17, 34n29; Great
Rhētra 19; Heraclids 44; kingship in 17,
18, 31, 129, 184–5; mixed constitution
169; and Xenophon 134, 136, 149n79

stasis 45, 50, 168, 186

stranger kings 84

Strauss, Leo 2, 98, 100, 103, 148nn67,
72

supplication 44–52

surveillance 126

synoecism 9, 48, 51–2, 72, 76, 172, 189

technē: *basilikē* 102–4; *politikē* 104, 108–10

temperance *see sōphrosunē*

thauma/thōma 25, 28, 29, 37n104, 113,
197; kingship as spectacular 143–4

Thebes 46–9, 53

Theophrastus 77

Theseus 2, 4–6, 92, 96, 113, 131, 165,
172; abducting Helen 78–9; agent of

unification 76–7, 189; analogy for
political leaders 83; in history 68–9,
76–86; model for kings 124, 189; in
tragedy 39–41, 47–52

Thucydides 39, 50, 64n93, 183; and local
history 69, 72, 74, 76, 88n38; and myth
69, 72, 74

time 151

Tomyris 20, 140

tyranny 16–17, 24, 39, 55–8, 80, 93, 104,
107–10; of Athens 71–2; ‘despotic
template’ 5, 13, 126, 128, 136–7; in
ethnos states 136–7; established by
kings 127; as form of rule 115; *kosmios*
turannos 171–2; opposed to law 99;
unity 9, 20–1, 24–5, 39–40, 43, 60, 76,
168

Vidal-Naquet, Pierre 40, 41

virtue 81, 95, 97, 186–91; basilike *technē*
as 103; friendship and 143; leadership
105; monarchy and 122–50

women: daughters of kings 45–7, 54–5;
epistemic status of 20; mothers of kings
36n77, 41–4, 48–9, 137; wives of kings
54–5, 141

Xenophon 6, 92, 95–106, 153; *basilike*
technē in 97–104; *Cyropaedia* 100,
122–3, 134–44, 153–4, 187–9; *Hiero*
187–8; *Memorabilia* 84–5, 99–104;
Oeconomicus 99, 104–6; on profit/
advantage 118n46; *Symposium* 96

Xerxes 16–17, 18, 31, 41–4, 135, 170, 187

Zeus 8, 17, 32, 39, 42, 47, 55–7, 60–1; Age
of Zeus 152, 154–8, 161, 164; as king
128, 181; and underworld 109